DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 469 SO 012 783

AUTHOR Alexander, Mary Sheron
TITLE A Survey of High School Social Studies Teachers' Attitudes Toward Museum Education Programs.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 117p.: Master's Thesis, Yale University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research: *Museums: Research Needs: Secondary Education: *Social Studies: *Surveys: *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This research surveyed high school teachers' attitudes towards museums as educational institutions and toward museum educators as fellow professionals. The survey attempts to find out why, of all age levels, the high school age is least represented in the general public which comes to the museum. Previous research on this topic has focused on the effectiveness of elementary school children's tours of museums. Social studies literature has ignored the subject. A questionnaire was mailed to all high school social studies teachers in Hampden and Worcester counties in southern Massachusetts. Eighty one of 250 teachers completed and returned the questionnaires. Findings show that secondary teachers do not indicate a strong desire to work with museum staff, nor do they view museum educators as professionals who share common interests and concerns. The survey also showed that high school teachers have a limited understanding of the pedagogical value of museum visits. While teachers do think that museums offer valuable learning experiences not available in school classrooms, they seem uncertain about the value of hands on experiences in museums and the museum's role in developing students' analytical skills. There is a need for museum personnel to offer more concrete evidence that museum visits provide significant learning experiences for high school students. There is also a need for a research study on how museum educators view high school teachers. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190469

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary S. Alexander

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD MUSEUM EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Mary Sheron Alexander

A.B., Beloit College, 1967

Sp 012 783

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

at

The University of Connecticut

1980

APPROVAL PAGE

Master of Arts Thesis

A SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD MUSEUM EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Presented by

Mary Sheron Alexander, A.B.

Major Adviser _____

Associate Adviser _____

Associate Adviser _____

The University of Connecticut

1980

AUG 18 1980

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments . . . . . .

Chapter 1, Review of the Literature 1

Chapter 2, Statement of the Problem 11

Chapter 3, Design of the Instrument 26

Chapter 4, The Findings 34

Chapter 5, Discussion and Conclusions 55

Footnotes 61

Bibliography 64

Appendix A 68

Acknowledgments

Projects such as this although pursued by one individual, rely on the support of many people. This support can be personal, professional or administrative and each in its own way is essential to the success of the project.

On the personal level, the encouragement and friendship of Ann Bay, Carol Bennett, Dick Bennett, Phil Griffith, Dr. Janet Kaplan, Nancy Malan, Charlie Mitsakos, Mary Weinland, and Nancy Winbury made the pursuit of this project possible and at times fun.

Professionally, the assistance of Bob Gable, Professor of Education, Bureau of Educational Research, with the statistical elements of this study made chapters 3 and 4 much less terrifying. Two Museum Education Staff of Old Strubridge Village, Warren Leon and Peter O'Connell, helped with the development and financing of the survey. As practicing museum educators, their comments kept this project firmly grounded in reality. Associate Advisers, Tony Gregorc and Alberta Sebolt, each contributed a special perspective to this project. Nancy Malan of the National Archives and Ann Bay at the Smithsonian Institution read large sections of this paper; their critical comments vastly improved this final version.

On the administrative level, Mary Tremko, secretary in the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, helped with typing, crossed her fingers for me as the survey returns came in, and kept me informed of University requirements after I had returned to Washington. She always did so with friendliness and good humor. Pat Tuttle of OSV assisted in identifying the teachers to be surveyed and typing the labels for the mailing. Jay and Chris Weinland, bribed with promises of ice cream, helped stuff the survey envelopes. Sue Stout keypunched the responses for the computer. Pam Britnell ably typed the final copy.

Two extra special people supported me throughout this project; it would not have happened without them. Elsie Freivogel, Program Director of Academic and Curricular Development, National Archives, graciously approved my leave of absence to pursue my Master's degree and encouraged me from beginning to end. Meeting Tim Weinland in 1976 was one of those happy accidents that changed the course of my life. His encouragement made it possible for me to come to Connecticut and create this project.

* * * *

This thesis is dedicated to my parents; to my Father who took me to live in a museum when I was two months old, and to my Mother who never would have gone to graduate school had she been me.

Chapter 1

The angles of the National Gallery's east wing reflected the late October sun as delegates entered the auditorium to attend the Smithsonian Institution's "Children in Museums" conference held in observance of the United Nation's International Year of the Child (1979). Bruno Bettleheim led the array of international experts presenting their views of childhood and its importance to museums. Panel discussions, artistic slide shows, and the usual droll quips of the moderators absorbed the attention of the audience of two hundred international museum professionals for three days.

On the third day of the conference, a panel of the most poised, washed, and fashionably ethnically balanced young people (ages 10-15) offered their reactions to Washington, D.C. museum resources and programs. Out of the mouths of these middle class babes. . . Charming and humorous? But, of course! But, in this demonstration of urban multi-ethnic chic, something or someone was missing. Where were their teachers: those master planners and organizers who hassle and cajole school principals and bus schedulers to provide "enrichment" experiences for children? Not one appeared as a panelist or discussant, nor did one rise from a seat during the question/answer sessions at the end of the

panelists' remarks. How curious that such a conference would not include those adults responsible for bringing most museums and children together. Or, is it so curious? In fact, the "Children in Museums" conference accurately reflected a long term failure of museums to include teachers in such discussions.

This paper seeks to explain the communication gap between museums and high school teachers, an audience that many museums have ignored. It attempts through an attitude survey to describe teachers' perceptions of museums and museum staff. It reviews how museum staffs and teachers have viewed one another in the past, and why it is not unusual that teachers did not participate in the "Children in Museums" conference.

The earliest European museums served the interests of the elite. Most collectors of art, historical objects, or scientific specimens opened their "cabinets" only to other connoisseurs. There was no need for, nor interest in, educating these visitors, as special knowledge was their "admission ticket." American museums broke with these precedents by requiring no special credentials for their visitors; they welcomed the unknowing public. In 1869 the board of the American Museum of Natural History adopted as its motto: "For the public, for education, for science." The motto reflected the prevailing attitudes of American museum professionals toward the general public. Edward Alexander, in his history of museums, stated:

> By 1900 American museums were becoming centers of education and public enlightenment. This development was natural in a country that prided itself on its democratic ideals and placed deep faith in public education both as a political necessity and as a means of attaining technological excellence.[1]

Education for the general public naturally joined scholarly research as a central purpose of American museums.

This education embraced children as well as adults. The first programs for young people began in the mid-nineteenth century as simplified versions of adult lectures. By the close of that century, these efforts had evolved into excursions especially designed for groups of school children. The classroom teacher emerged as the natural conduit for bringing museums and young people together, and teachers assumed their place as a special audience for museum programs.

In 1880, the American Museum of Natural History in collaboration with the New York City Public School system offered the first lecture series for teachers.[2] Designed to train teachers in the use of the "visual method" (illustrated lectures), the series included lectures by the museum's director and curators. The lectures became so popular that one class numbered 1,200. This approach to teachers was adopted by other museums around the country so that by 1930 there were fifty-two museum training programs for teachers.[3]

At the start of the twentieth century teachers brought their students to museums to expose them to physical

objects. As these objects represented the best of American culture and tradition, teachers considered exposure to these value statements, especially for elementary students, beneficial in nurturing young "democrats." The writings of John Dewey and popular teacher training texts further stimulated school excursions as "modern" teachers pursued the progressive ideals. Grace Fisher Ramsey noted:

> During the period from 1920 to 1930 teachers were just beginning to realize the vast possibilities in the use of the original materials and objects of museum collections for vitalizing school subjects and providing both instructors and pupils with unparalleled opportunities for careful observation.[4]

At this time elementary teachers assumed their place as a special museum audience, and museum staffs responded accordingly with programs designed especially for children.

Over the years elementary groups have consistently outnumbered high school visitors to museums. In 1940, Elisabeth Jane Merrill, Supervisor of Education at the Toledo Museum of Art sought to explain this phenomenon:

> The work with high schools is only in its beginning. . . . Most museums have found this a more difficult level than the earlier years. To be sure there have been difficulties; schedules are full, out-of-school activities programs are insistent, to work is sometimes a necessity, and interests have shifted. Have we not possibly accepted these difficulties instead of trying to work out the problems?[5]

Six years later, the comments of Thomas Munro of the Cleveland Museum of Art revealed that museum educators had not yet heeded Merrill's advice:

> Of all age-levels, the high school age is least represented in the general public which comes to the museum. . . . I know of no conference at which museum people and secondary education people have been systematically and equally represented.[6]

Of course the preoccupation with the war during the 1940's may explain museums' low interest in high school programs. During those years, Museum News' pages were filled with discussions of a museum's role in the war effort. Regretably, Mr. Munro's comments are just as applicable to today's situation between museums and secondary schools.

In the 1950's, museums benefitted from the post-war baby boom and welcomed a continuing flow of elementary students in neat lines two-by-two, while high school students continued to stay away. Even with the end of World War II, special programs for adolescents were uncommon. For example, Colonial Williamsburg's Student Burgesses Program, begun in the late 1940's, offered high school students an opportunity to interact with foreign students in this country under the sponsorship of the American Field Service. The students spent four days discussing the problems of maintaining the democratic government that began in the colonial capital of Virginia. A quality program to be sure, but it remained a special event for a very select group of students. Other museums around the country did not replicate the program and high school students remained insignificant as a museum audience.

During the 1960's federal funds stimulated research into new approaches to traditional school subjects including

the social studies. Project Social Studies sought to reform the teaching of history and the other social sciences including geography, sociology and anthropology. The discovery or inquiry method* emerged as the technique to make history more relevant to students. The federal projects encouraged teachers to engage students in the historical process through primary evidence--documents, oral histories, objects as reflections of culture, and anthropological-type studies of historical sites and buildings. Student involvement in the "stuff" of history emerged as a positive force in social studies teaching.

While federal funds encouraged schools to experiment with new strategies, museum educators adapted inquiry approaches at their sites without such recognition or support. Although the museums rarely defined inquiry, they began to encourage teachers to use their objects, buildings, and resources as learning laboratories for inquiry teaching. A 1972 study of the status of museum programs for young people offered clear evidence that museums were encouraging the inquiry method, especially for fourth through sixth graders. The study's twenty-four examples abound with descriptions of "hands-on" activities, "informal discussions," "touch it rooms," and "student hypotheses." Inquiry assumed

---

*Inquiry applied the scientific method to historical information. Educators argued that students can best understand the past through analyzing its component parts (facts and inferences) and generating and testing hypotheses based on those component parts.

a central place in the repertoire of museum education programs. However, this study also testified to the limited high school audiences in most museums. Author Ann Bay offered this explanation:

> High school students make infrequent use of museums during the school day for two primary reasons: teachers find it difficult to work field trips into a rigid schedule, and few teenagers enjoy the usual guided tour. Unless a museum offers a program suited specifically for the high school level the students are apt to be unenthusiastic. All of the museums visited welcomed teenagers to take part in regular formal programs, but few go beyond that. [7 The study included nine such programs.]

During the nation's bicentennial year, three significant reports on education and museums appeared. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare studied the nature of adolescent education and recommended changes of great potential impact on museums. A blue ribbon panel of the American Council of the Arts, chaired by David Rockefeller, collected evidence of the country's art education efforts and a task force of the American Association of Museums (AAM) studied the impact of current curriculum practices on museums. Each of these three reports contributes to an understanding of the current status of museum education and high school teachers and students.

The HEW panel on the status of adolescent education recommended a startling shift in secondary education. In his foreword to the panel's report, Commissioner of Education T.H. Bell wrote:

> The Panel concluded that we have drifted into an excessive reliance on the high

> school as the instrument for "educating" teenagers and preparing them to enter adulthood; that this burden must be reduced; and that we must examine anew what can be done to strengthen the educational role of the family, the church, the media, and other institutions that play vital roles in the education of our youth.[8]

Clearly museums are institutions equipped to share the "burden" of exposing youth to the aesthetic, historical, and scientific values of our culture. The panel report continued in this vein:

> The Panel would shift the emphasis away from the comprehensive school toward comprehensive education, arguing that the confines of one [school] building are no longer enough to contain all the valuable and necessary experiences for today's young person.[9]

Decentralizing the educational process certainly would benefit museums' educational efforts. And one assumes museum educators would welcome such an opportunity for joint cooperation with schools. However, recommendations such as these from HEW are only as influential as local school boards allow them to be, and from the vantage of 1980, no massive decentralizing of schools is in progress.

Paralleling the HEW report, the Rockefeller panel reported a dearth of art education courses or activities in today's school curricula. Kathryn Bloom of the JDR 3rd Fund made a strong appeal for increased militancy on the part of art educators:

> There is a very simple fact about the arts in education: literally, nobody is against them. . . . Arts education must move from having no enemies to having more and more

> ardent friends in order to win a position in which it can realize the potential we believe it holds for the individual and for the nation.[10]

Beyond powerful friends, however, witnesses before the panel recommended better teacher education to assure the arts a place in the public school curricula. Judith Aronson, chair of the Aesthetic Education Program at Webster College in Missouri, made this important statement about teachers today:

> Eighty percent of the teachers who will be teaching in ten years are already in the classroom. . . . If you ask me "where should we put our money?," I would say put it into teacher re-education, in-service education, the renewal of teachers. . .Put your money there.[11]

Her comments were reinforced by the report of the curriculum task force of the American Association of Museums. The task force concluded:

> Little if any materials are available to teachers coming for tours to help plan for the event or provide followup activities. . . . The cultural institution should provide training and materials for teachers on how to use the institution and help the teacher plan the field trip.[12]

Museums must commit their energies and funds to providing teachers with quality training programs and materials for incorporating, let us call it "aesthetic education," into the school curricula.

As we face the 1980's the enthusiasm for inquiry has waned and HEW's call for comprehensive education has

not materialized. Schools appear to be retrenching behind what is called "basics" education, and seem to be content with processing graduates that are literate and can make correct change at a cash register. Hampered by rising energy costs, declining school enrollments, and teacher malaise, local school systems are not taking the lead in innovative, out-of-classroom experiences. Museums face the challenge of convincing educators that cultural or aesthetic education belongs under the rubric of "basic" education.

To meet this challenge museum educators together with teachers must identify their common needs, develop programs to fill those needs, and carefully measure the educational effectiveness of such programs. To this end, this paper attempts to better identify high school teachers as an audience for museum education programs.

Chapter 2

After one hundred years of museum programming for teachers and their students, how do teachers view these efforts by museums? Are museum professionals concerned with their perceptions? Museum literature offers limited and contradictory answers. In Museums and the Teacher, a pamphlet published by the Friends of the Corpus Christi Museum, Museum Director Aalbert Heine suggested these reactions by teachers to museum programs:

> The majority of museums search for the opportunity to help the educator. Where there is insufficient coordination, these attempts are sometimes misunderstood or may even be regarded as a form of competition [by the teacher].[13]

Richard Grove satirized teachers' awe for the museum in Museums and Education:

> Indeed, many educators pay strange tribute to the museum mystique. They think it beneficial to children to simply march them through the museum at top speed and in as straight a line as possible considering that those exhibits keep blocking the way.[14]

The editors of The Art Museum as Educator offered a more sympathetic picture of teachers' perceptions of museums:

> ...for many teachers the museum is a cold, incomprehensible place, where mute objects of uncertain educational value follow on each other in confusing sequence. The floors are hard, the children unruly, the bus trip a hassle,....and the museum staff not always sympathetic or skillfull.[15]

These descriptions of teachers from popular museum literature are typical; typical in their impressionistic tone and lack of analysis. Museum professionals have not sought to understand teachers' perceptions of their institutions as learning environments. Therefore, their comments about teachers are subjective and imprecise.

The search for evidence of high school teachers' perceptions of museums is a frustrating activity. Museum publications, if they discuss teachers at all, discuss the character and needs of their most frequent users, elementary teachers. Most museum literature justifies the limited use of museums by high school teachers as resulting from scheduling problems and the "peculiar" nature of adolescents. Museum publications such as Museum News, The Museologist, or Curator do not describe or discuss in detail teachers' perceptions of and attitudes toward museums. Those publications directed at teachers and educational administrators are no better; occasional articles on the process of organizing the annual field trip appear most often. One reads little thoughtful analysis of the value of such experiences in the journals of either profession.

The recently published volume, The Art Museum As Educator, was one exception. This report of a four year study of American art education discussed the nature of art teachers' perceptions of museums and the impact of their perceptions on both museum staff and programs. Chapter ten of this massive volume began:

> For years, art museum educators have been trying to pry secondary school students out of their classrooms and into museums. It has been a notoriously difficult task. . . most high school students have hewed to rigid daily schedules, which allowed no time for travel...[16]

This inauspicious opening, so reminiscent of other museum publications, developed in Chapter eleven into a careful analysis of both museum educator and teacher attitudes toward art museum programming. In a section entitled "Understanding the Teacher," the editors revealed a highly sympathetic regard for the interests of classroom art instructors. For example:

> Schoolteachers worry about the relaxation of discipline in the museum, the tendency of museum instructors to move too fast or to use terms that are unfamiliar to the children, or the failure of museum educators or docents to try to understand the learning process in children.[17]

While the writers acknowledged the concerns of teachers as museum clients, they placed responsibility for improving museum programs squarely on the shoulders of museum educators. They called for better communication between museum educator and teacher, emphasizing the need for museum educators to better understand the demands and limitations of the school environment. The concluded their discussion of teachers with this statement: "It is a rare teacher who knows the museum, perhaps, but it seems to be a rarer museum educator who knows the school."[18]

At best The Art Museum As Educator provides only a glimpse of art teachers' perceptions of museums. Museum publications' discussions of teachers leave the reader with many unanswered questions. To learn more of teachers' attitudes, one must look for evidence outside museum literature. This researcher relied on social studies literature for this evidence because social studies teachers lead most high school visits to museums. Several small research studies of social studies teaching strategies offered insight into teacher attitudes toward non-classroom instruction, attitudes that might affect teachers' use of museums. Social studies methods textbooks in their treatment of field trips as teaching techniques also reflect current teacher attitudes. Finally, the pages of Social Education, a national social studies magazine, served as a measure of social studies educators' interest in museum visits. The evidence gleaned from these sources follows.

Research Studies

What have "scientific" researchers discovered about teachers' attitudes toward high school field trips to museums? From the outset one is struck by the dearth of information available. Three small studies of the nature of teaching social studies provided some evidence, although inferential, of teachers' perceptions of museum educational experiences.

One of these studies conducted in Maryland in 1970 documented negative attitudes toward most participatory

experiences for high school students. The University of Maryland researchers asked parents, students, and teachers of one school district to rank in order the educational value of twenty-four high school learning activities. The activities included lecture/discussions, role-playing, debates, essay writing, mapping exercises, library assignments, and artifact analysis. The teachers rated as the most valuable assignment on the list a discussion and writing exercise to distinguish fact from opinion. Museum field trips were not even suggested on the activities list. However, the researchers reached this conclusion:

> The low esteem with which almost all of the groups...had for activities which place students in active learning roles needs the attention of the educational leaders of the district. These findings suggest, ever so mildly, that teachers, parents, and students alike view schooling as basically lesson-giving and recitation.....a vigorous program designed to encourage members of the community to inquire into the worthiness of these approaches must be initiated.[19]

This conclusion was startling in its call for a change in the status quo. If the researchers were so concerned about active learning experiences, why was there no mention of field trips or other non-classroom activities on the activities list? The absence of field trips suggests that the researchers themselves viewed high school classrooms as dominated by traditional teacher-led lessons. Nor does the study represent teachers as actively seeking to break traditional patterns through museum field trips or other activities designed to increase student involvement. Why

the researchers reached the conclusions they did remains unclear.

A Kansas study challenges the findings of the Maryland researchers. One hundred and twenty-two Kansas social studies teachers rated the importance of thirty skills of high school social studies students. The Kansas teachers selected as the most important skill for high school students to master: "To distinguish fact from opinion." Unlike the Maryland study, however, "To gather facts from field trips and interviews" did appear on the Kansas skill list. The teachers gave that item an average rating of fifteen, mid-point on the scale.[20] In contrast to the Maryland study, both the researchers in their inclusion of field trips on the instrument and the ratings of the teachers indicated support for field trip experiences for high school students.

In 1975, the Indiana Council for the Social Studies surveyed the state's social studies teachers in grades six through twelve to ascertain their training needs. The Council sought teachers' preferences for the type of training desired, as well as its content. In the category, "Classroom Techniques," most teachers requested guidance in teaching reading (64%) while only thirty-six percent sought help with "in and out of classroom experimental activities."[21] The teachers indicated less interest in training in "alternative classroom approaches." Within that category, forty-six percent of the teachers requested help

in using "mini-courses," while only eighteen percent ranked "alternative social studies schooling/schools without walls" as an area of training interest.[22] Although the needs assessment did not specifically mention museum field trips, one can assume they might fit within these two categories of the survey. Such responses seem to reflect a lack of interest in being better trained to use non-classroom teaching strategies. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions from a needs assessment, as a low desire for training may indicate disinterest or a feeling of competence on the part of the teachers.

The findings of these three small studies related only tangentially to high school teachers' perceptions of museums as learning environments. None of the studies specifically asked the teachers to weigh the value of museum visits for their students. The very absence of this question tells us something. Furthermore, the negative, or at best ambivalent, attitudes toward active learning roles and alternative classroom approaches reflected in these studies suggest that teachers would not view museums as vital learning experiences for their students. High school teachers do not emerge from this evidence as especially interested in using museums as learning sites. However, the influences of the high school environment, the teachers' own training, and the nature of the adolescent learner, on these attitudes remain unmeasured and unknown.

Teacher Training

While the three research studies included small samples, and related only indirectly to teachers' attitudes toward museums, how social studies methods textbooks treat field trips is a useful indicator of potential teacher attitudes. From these texts one can determine how high school social studies teachers are taught to use field trips and what educational value is placed on such experiences.

There are many secondary social studies methods texts. The "New Social Studies" movement of the 1960's stimulated publication of numerous "strategy" books promoting the inquiry method. In nine of the major social studies texts published between 1940 and 1973, five chapters examined field trips. The depth of this coverage varied greatly. Most authors presented field trips as a technique to alter classroom routine, and proceeded to offer practical planning suggestions. It is curious that in those texts specifically endorsing inquiry teaching, the mention of field trips declined noticeably. Benjamin Cox and Bryon Massialas in Inquiry in Social Studies suggested reasons for this waning interest:

> In recent years, the social studies field trip has fallen into disrepute. This has been the result, at least in part, of the generally intellectually purposeless and unrewarding nature of the field trip activity. It is rare...where the visit is guided by a search for evidence or new points of view. In most cases a field trip amounts to a day off from school.[23]

Although the authors did not attach blame for this condition, they implied that the best atmosphere for inquiry is the classroom or the library.

The texts revealed that teachers are not being trained or encouraged to use museums or other out-of-classroom experiences as educational tools at the high school level. The textbook authors concentrated on general administrative details of the trips (permission slips, liability, and bus fees) while they neglected the educational potential of the experience. From the perspective of the texts, one can be a well-trained teacher, even using inquiry techniques, and ignore field trips as an educational tool.

Teacher Publications

A review of the publications of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) offered further insight into teachers' attitudes toward museum visits. The Council was founded in 1921 to promote the study of the problems of teaching social studies from the perspective of elementary, secondary and college level teachers. NCSS has published its magazine, Social Education, since 1937.

How has Social Education represented field trips in the forty-one years of its publication? The chart that follows illustrates the journal's coverage of field trips and other related topics. The topic, "Community Resources," includes articles on student projects such as

surveying community social services, interviewing city officials, and the like. The emphasis is generally sociological. "Local History" articles describe projects in which students study the community from the historical perspective. "Museums" defines articles written most often by museum staff members describing their educational programs or exhibitions. Articles classified as "Field Trips" specifically suggest procedures and ideas for organizing out-of-school trips to museums, libraries and factories. "Teacher Training" encompasses articles on teaching teachers how to use community resources, local history, museums, and field trips. These articles were generally written by college and university professors.

If one believed museums were an integral part of social studies instruction, eight articles on the subject in this respected journal in forty-one years undermines that assumption. Eliminate the issue of Social Education dedicated to teaching strategies for the Bicentennial (1975) and there were only three articles about museums in twenty years (1958-1978). While museum educators viewed the 1960's inquiry trend as a natural link between the classroom and the museum collection, this connection was missing in the social studies literature. With the current emphasis in social studies on "basic" education, one cannot assume that either aesthetic appreciation or cultural literacy are subsumed under that rubric.

In addition to Social Education, NCSS publishes an annual yearbook and a pamphlet series, "How To Do It."

Social Education

Year	Community Resources	Local History	Museums	Field Trips	Teacher Training
1937	3				
1938					
1939	3				
1940	1	3			
1941				1	1
1942		1			
1943	1				
1944		1			2
1945					
1946	2				
1947					
1948				2	
1949					
1950	2				
1951					
1952					
1953					
1954	1				
1955			2		1
1956				2	
1957	1				
1958	1		1		
1959		1			
1960					
1961					
1962					
1963		1			
1964					
1965	1				
1966	1				
1967		1			
1968				1	
1969			2		
1970					1
1971					
1972					
1973					
1974		1		2	
1975		2	3	1	
1976	3				
1977		1			
1978					
Totals	20	12	8	9	5

The yearbook series began in 1931 with "Some Aspects of the Social Sciences in Schools." Leaders in social studies serve as editors for the yearbooks that focus on topics of current national interest. The contributors to the Ninth Yearbook (1938), "Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Studies," discussed such topics as the value of the community as a learning experience, the potential for local historical agencies as educational resources, and the need for teacher training in how to use the community. In the preface to the 1938 Yearbook, Editor Ruth West suggested that teachers need to be better trained to use the community:

> Teachers whose entire training and experience has been of the academic type find it difficult, even though the theory of community study and participation meets with their whole-hearted approval, to develop over night techniques for putting the theory into practice.[24]

In chapter four, "Acquainting the Teacher with the Community," Edward Olsen reiterated West's concern: "Carefully planned and executed field trips should become part of every teacher's personal and professional background."[25] Another contributor portrayed community study as an "unmistakable trend"[26] in social studies.

Nine years and as many yearbooks later, NCSS published "Audio-Visual Materials and Methods in the Social Studies." Three chapters of the yearbook explored teaching with objects, museums and field trips. Henry Atyeo offered evidence of teachers' attitudes toward museums in his

chapter, "The Excursion in Social Education":

> The teachers very often find, however, that the professional guide can not adequately meet the needs of a high school group because he knows neither the things in which the students are particularly interested nor the preparation which has been made for the visit...[He quotes a teacher as saying:] "Usually guides are too technical and talk over youngsters' heads."[27]

Ella Hawkinson in her chapter, "Museums, Schools, and Community Cooperation," recommended greater teacher-museum cooperation:

> The establishment of the educational philosophy of a museum depends not on the museum itself but on the cooperative action taken by the schools and other educational agencies of the community in sharing the work.[28]

While each of these authors encouraged cooperative planning, none explored the educational potential for out-of-school experiences. In each of the chapters on museums, concern for administrative details dominated. There was little evidence of the "unmistakable trend" predicted nine years earlier.

The 1953 and 1963 yearbooks examined student skills in the social studies. In both volumes, skills associated with field trips filled less than one page. In fact, the 1963 Yearbook simply repeated the 1953 field trip discussion with new examples of sites to visit. Museums or other field trip sites were not discussed as environments for practicing analytical skills; they were simply presented as nice places to visit.

On a smaller scale, NCSS's "How To Do It" series reflected the same bias as the other NCSS publications. "How to Use Local History," "How to Conduct a Field Trip," and "How to Utilize Community Resources" offered teachers practical advice and guidance. However, they consistently neglected application of skills and the potential for learning in out-of-school settings. In "How to Conduct a Field Trip," author E.C. Bye from Montclair State College in New Jersey, recommended the use of trips as important concrete learning experiences. In keeping with the practical tone of the series, he emphasized the planning and administrative elements of the process. Generally, the pamphlets tell you how to...but not why.

The museum literature relating to teachers, especially high school teachers, leaves us with vague impressions. The social studies literature offers more information about teachers and museums, but that information is also impressionistic. We do know that social studies teachers are neither specifically trained nor formally encouraged to use museum field trips with their students. Why not remains unclear. The evidence from social studies publications seems to reflect the traditional image of the high school classroom--teacher lecturing to attentive students. The trend towards greater use of field trips predicted in 1938 has never materialized. Inquiry teaching, so popular in the 1960's, may have stimulated the use of primary source materials with high school students, but this use does not extend into the museum setting. Whether because of the elementary

schedule or the nature of young learners, the museum field trip remains a teaching technique of elementary, not high school, teachers.

The relationship between museum educators and high school teachers reflects a condition of benign neglect on the part of both museum and school. There seems to be no pressure from either quarter, museum or school, to alter this situation. Museums use the school schedule and student passivity while "on tour" to explain their neglect of high schools. While high school teachers, even those practicing inquiry teaching, make no great effort to incorporate museum visits into their schedules. A desire to better identify the reasons for this situation led to the development of the teacher attitude survey discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

This researcher sought to ascertain high school teachers' perceptions of museums from the teachers themselves. To do so a survey was designed to identify high school teachers' attitudes toward museums as educational institutions and toward museum educators as fellow professionals. The survey sought to answer those questions about high school teachers and museums not addressed by previous researchers.

The survey evolved from questions such as: What is the character of the high school audience for museums? How do high school teachers view museum educators? What are high school teachers' expectations for a class visit to a museum? Are teachers interested in inquiry approaches in the museums they visit? Do they view museums as sites where students practice the historical process? Do teachers expect their students to be involved in "hands-on" activities in museums? Do they view museums as sites where students develop learning skills? If so, what kind of skills? What is the effect of the organization of the high school on class trips? These questions and others like them formed the basis for a two-part teacher attitude survey.

The first section of the survey entitled "Planning" asked the teachers to react to statements about planning for

a museum visit and coordinating the trip with museum staff. This section emphasized the school and the logistics of a museum visit. It included eleven items relating to administrative concerns in the school and between school and museum. These concerns encompassed the school schedule, finances, and teacher preparation time. The items covering the interaction between school and museum sought the teachers' reactions to museum educators as cooperative partners; to the value of planning with museum staff; to teacher visits to the museum, and museum staff visits to the school, before the class trip; and to student follow-up projects.

The second part of the survey entitled "The Museum as Teacher" directed the respondents to "...focus on the museum's education program, NOT the administrative problems of taking your class on a trip." It asked the teachers to react to fourteen statements about museums as learning environments. These statements emerged from questions such as: Do museums help students to like history? Do students gain a sense of history in a museum? Do "hands-on" activities help students to learn in museums? Does the non-structured nature of museums stimulate student learning? In addition to these questions, the survey asked the teachers to compare the relative value of museum visits for their students with elementary students, with less able students, and with students working in the classroom. This section of the survey also asked the respondents to weigh the overall

value of museum visits as learning experiences and the role of those visits in their own curriculum planning.

Two groups of reviewers assessed the content validity of the survey. The reviewers included three museum education staff members, seven high school social studies teachers, and one university professor. Six of the reviewers considered the entire survey, while five reviewed only the second section. The reviewers rated the items in the first section as indicators of "museum/school relations," or "planning." Both groups classified the items in the second part of the survey as measures of "process" or "product," two dimensions of learning. In all, they rated thirty-one items; six were eliminated based on their recommendations, while others were edited for clarity. See Table 1 for the results.

The survey instrument used a five point Likert-scale. The instructions directed respondents to indicate the strength of their reactions to twenty-five statements about museum trips for high school students in a series of boxes designated from left to right "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Uncertain," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." See Table 2.

The front page of the survey solicited information from the respondents about their teaching situations and educational experience. It asked about the subjects taught, length of teaching experience, educational background, frequency of museum visits, and the names of those museums visited in the past two years. Those surveyed

taught courses ranging from U.S. history to consumer economics. They all taught either junior or senior high school social studies. They reflected a wide range of teaching experience; a first year teacher completed the survey as did a veteran of more than forty years. All held Bachelor's degrees, and many had completed work beyond the Master's degree. The information provided on yearly museum visits was invalidated because it was unclear whether the respondents listed their own visits to museums or those of their classes. The list of museums visited by the subjects was a long one; it included many local area museums as well as those in New York City and Washington, D.C.

The survey was mailed to all high school social studies teachers in Hampden and Worcester counties in Southern Massachusetts in late April, 1979. A second survey was sent two weeks later in mid-May. These counties provided a total sample size of 250 teachers and each county reflected like characteristics in population density, area, and access to museums. Each of the counties' major cities, Springfield and Worcester, has several museums in close proximity to the county school systems. Eighty-one teachers completed and returned the questionnaire. The self-selecting nature of a mail survey requires that caution be used when drawing conclusions from the results, as they may reflect more positive attitudes toward museums than would emerge from the general population of high school social studies teachers. The small sample size also limits the applicability

of these conclusions. The analysis of these results appears in the next chapter.

Table 1

Frequency scores of content validity reviewers

Part 1			Part 2		
Item #	Museum/School Relations	Planning	Item #	Process	Product
1	2	5	12	5	5
2	2	4	13	5	4
3	0	6	14	9	2
4	6	0	15	5	6
5	2	4	16	8	2
6	1	5	17	2	5
7	4	2	18	9	1
8	1	5	19	6	4
9	1	5	20*	1	4
10	0	6	21	2	3
11	(This item added later)		22	4	5
			23	2	4
			24	4	5
			25	6	2

*This item was rated by the second group of reviewers only.

Table 2

ATTITUDE SURVEY

I teach _____ _____

_____ _____

subject grade

Years of teaching experience _____

My highest academic degree is BA/BS

MA/MS

MA +

PhD

(circle one)

My yearly visits to museums number _____

List the museums you have visited with your class in the past two years:

_____

_____

_____

_____

PLANNING

This is a survey of high school social studies teachers' opinions about field trips to museums. Check the box that indicates your personal response to the statements below. There are no correct answers. Please indicate a response for each item on the survey.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Cooperative planning with the museum education staff is essential for an educationally valuable class visit to a museum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Museum visits require more time and effort on my part than they are worth educationally for my students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Careful planning is an essential element of a successful museum visit.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Museum education staff members are aware of my needs as a classroom teacher.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. A visit to my classroom by museum staff before the museum visit improves the museum visit.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. A visit by me to the museum before the class trip increases the educational value of the trip for my students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Museum education staff members are willing to help me in planning my class's visit to the museum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The expense of buses, museum admissions, and other costs prevent my class from visiting museums.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The school schedule prevents me from taking classes on museum visits.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. A follow-up activity for my students is an essential element of a successful museum visit.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Museum education staff members encourage high school class visits.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

THE MUSEUM AS TEACHER

This section of the survey focuses on your attitudes toward the educational elements of a museum visit for high school social studies classes. In responding to the statements below, focus on the museum's **education program**, NOT the administrative problems of taking your class on a trip.

Check the box that indicates your personal response to the statements below. There are no correct answers. Please indicate a response for each item on the survey.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12. Museum school tours offer valuable learning experiences not available in the classroom.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. High school students view a class visit to a museum as a day off from learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Students practice valuable analytical skills working with historical objects and documents in museums.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Museum visits are more valuable educationally for slower students than more able students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Museum tours for high school students are too structured to stimulate learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Time spent by high school students on a museum trip would be better spent in class.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Student participation in "hands on" activities at the museum is essential for learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Museum visits are educationally more valuable for elementary than high school students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. It is important to hold students responsible for information gained on a museum trip.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Museum visits are integral elements of my curriculum.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Museum visits provide students with a sense of their place in history.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. The content of museum school tours is not interesting to high school students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. A museum visit helps high school students to like history.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Museum guides use effective teaching techniques for high school students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Chapter 4

Three computer procedures, Chi Square, t-tests, and factor analysis, were applied to the survey results. This chapter presents the findings of those procedures. Chi Square and t-test procedures allow the comparison of responses of subgroups within a sample as identified by the researcher. In contrast, factor analysis statistically identifies subgroups--factors--within a sample. Factor analysis helped this researcher to identify those factors that might influence the survey responses and therefore warrant further analysis.

The sample provided five subgroups of particular interest:

> Years of Teaching The length of experience within the sample ranged from one to more than 40 years. The sample was arbitrarily divided between those teachers with less than 10 years experience (30) and those with more than 10 years experience (49).
>
> Subjects Taught The sample was divided between teachers of American history (48) and teachers of other social studies subjects (33).
>
> Grade Levels Taught Twelve of the teachers within the sample taught junior high/ middle school social studies (grades 7 and 8) while 69 of the teachers taught high school students (grades 9-12). These two groups were compared.

Academic Degree The sample was also divided by the highest academic degree achieved. To sharpen the contrast, teachers with Bachelor's degrees (18) were compared with those having completed more than a Master's degree (45).

Old Sturbridge Village The responses of teachers who have participated in programs at Old Sturbridge Village (19) were compared with those who have not used the Village with their classes (62).

The responses of each of these subgroups were compared using the Chi Square and t-test procedures.

Table 3 displays the item-by item responses to the survey for the entire sample of eighty-one teachers. The extreme right hand column of the table records the mean, or average, score for each item. The lower the mean score, the stronger the agreement with the survey statement and the more positive the attitude except where the survey items are negatively stated. The negatively stated items on the survey are #2, #15, #16, #17, #19, and #23. A high mean score on these six items indicates disagreement with the statement and therefore reflects a positive attitude. One gains a sense of the overall response pattern for the entire sample from this table.

Chi Square

Statisticians have mathematically established response patterns based on the nature of a given sample. They can statistically predict the "normal" response pattern for any sample. The Chi Square procedure helps the researcher to locate where responses diverge from this normal pattern.

Table 3

Survey Response Pattern

Item	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Uncertain (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Mean
#1						
Frequency*	36	33	5	6	0	
%	45	41	6	8	0	1.74
#2						
Frequency	6	7	12	39	15	
%	8	9	15	49	19	3.54[a]
#3						
Frequency	40	40	0	1	0	
%	49	49	0	2	0	1.53
#4						
Frequency	3	18	43	9	6	
%	4	23	54	11	8	2.89
#5						
Frequency	9	25	35	9	0	
%	11	32	45	11	0	2.47
#6						
Frequency	32	41	6	1	1	
%	40	51	7	1	1	1.74
#7						
Frequency	8	28	39	4	0	
%	10	35	50	5	0	2.43
#8						
Frequency	36	21	10	12	1	
%	45	26	13	15	1	1.99
#9						
Frequency	12	18	6	33	10	
%	15	23	7	42	13	3.06
#10						
Frequency	21	49	8	3	0	
%	26	60	10	4	0	1.91
#11						
Frequency	6	24	44	5	1	
%	8	30	55	6	1	2.61

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Uncertain (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Mean
#12						
Frequency	35	37	8	0	1	
%	43	46	10	0	1	1.70
#13						
Frequency	7	36	20	15	3	
%	9	44	25	18	4	2.64
#14						
Frequency	4	30	27	16	2	
%	5	38	34	20	3	2.70
#15						
Frequency	4	13	30	22	12	
%	5	16	37	27	15	3.31[a]
#16						
Frequency	2	6	27	39	6	
%	2	8	34	49	7	3.47[a]
#17						
Frequency	1	5	15	40	19	
%	1	6	19	50	24	3.84[a]
#18						
Frequency	10	35	19	15	1	
%	12	44	24	19	1	2.49
#19						
Frequency	1	11	28	25	16	
%	1	14	34	31	20	3.54[a]
#20						
Frequency	14	44	10	11	2	
%	17	54	12	14	3	2.30
#21						
Frequency	2	14	16	34	9	
%	3	19	21	45	12	3.20
#22						
Frequency	7	41	28	4	1	
%	8	51	35	5	1	2.40
#23						
Frequency	2	9	23	35	11	
%	2	11	29	44	14	3.51[a]

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Uncertain (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Mean
#24						
Frequency	7	34	29	9	2	
%	9	42	36	11	2	2.57
#25						
Frequency	1	18	42	14	1	
%	1	24	55	19	1	2.77

*Not all totals equal 81 due to missing responses.

[a]Items are negatively stated on instrument.

The researcher should seek to explain those variations from the normal pattern that are statistically significant (not a matter of chance). Table 4 highlights those items on the survey where the predetermined subgroups deviate from the predictable pattern. For complete Chi Square results, see Appendix A.

Of the five subgroups within the sample, two conform to established response patterns; neither years of teaching experience nor grade level taught affected the normal response patterns in any significant way. Teachers in these subgroups responded just as the statisticians predicted. Teachers of American history and those of other social studies subjects depart from the expected response pattern on only one survey item (#19), while teachers with Bachelor's degrees and those with more than a Master's degree only deviate from the norm on two items (#7 and #12).

The response patterns of the 19 teachers who visited Old Sturbridge Village deviate most from what is statistically expected. These teachers break the predicted pattern on five survey items (#4, #11, #19, #22, and #25). Their responses to those items that focus on museum staff (#4, #11, and #25) suggest that they have more positive attitudes toward museum educators than statistically expected. Their responses to items #19 and #22 also do not conform to the statistically established patterns. Through their responses to item #19 these teachers seem to recognize the value of museum visits for high school as well as

elementary students. Their responses to item #22 suggest that they believe museums aid high school students in developing a sense of their place in history. This response may help to further explain the teachers' positive responses to item #19. These response patterns seem to reflect positively on the educational programs and museum education staff of Old Sturbridge Village.

t-tests

T-tests compare the mean scores of two groups. In this case the t-tests compare the mean scores of the five subgroups listed above. If a t-test is statistically significant the researcher can assume there is a difference between the mean scores of the two groups and seek an explanation for that difference. Five t-tests revealed significant differences in the teachers' responses to four survey items. See Table 5.

The t-test results suggest that teachers with more teaching experience and more education are more likely to describe museum visits as integral elements of their curriculum than teachers with less experience or education. The other significant t-test results parallel those of the Chi Square. They suggest that teachers who have participated in Old Sturbridge Village's programs hold more positive attitudes toward museum education staff than those teachers not involved with the Village (see items #4 and #11). Item #22 also reappears as a significant item in the t-tests.

Table 4

Statistically Significant Chi Square Scores

Item	Years of Teaching	Subjects Taught	Grade Level	Academic Degree	Old Sturbridge Village
1. Cooperative planning					
2. Time and effort					
3. Careful planning					
4. My needs					***
5. Classroom visit					
6. Pre-visit					
7. Museum ed. staff help				*	
8. Costs					
9. School schedule					
10. Follow-up					
11. Encourage high school					***
12. Valuable learning				*	
13. Day off from learning					
14. Analytical skills					

Table 4 (continued)

Item	Years of Teaching	Subjects Taught	Grade Level	Academic Degree	Old Sturbridge Village
15. Slow v. fast students					
16. Too structured					
17. Better spent in class					
18. Hands on					
19. High school v. elementary		*			*
20. Hold students responsible					
21. Integral to curriculum					
22. Sense of history					*
23. Not interesting					
24. Like history					
25. Effective guides					***

*.05 level of significance
*** .001 level of significance

Table 5

Significant Item t-tests

Item Variable	# of responses	t-tests Mean	SD	t
#21 Experience (2-10 years)	30	3.63	.99	2.50**
(11 years+)	49	2.94	1.46	
#21 Degree (BA/S)	18	3.94	.80	3.77***
(MA/S+)	45	2.87	1.44	
#4 OSV Visitor	19	2.31	.88	-2.99**
Non-Visitor	62	3.06	.97	
#11 OSV Visitor	19	2.05	.84	-3.61***
Non-Visitor	62	2.77	.73	
#22 OSV Visitor	19	1.95	.70	-3.05 (.003)
Non-Visitor	62	2.53	.74	

** .01 level of significance

*** .001 level of significance

It reinforces the conclusion drawn from the Chi Square results that users of the Village believe museums help students to realize their place in history.

The t-test results reinforce those of the Chi Square. They suggest that Sturbridge Village staff's work with high school teachers and their students has developed more positive attitudes toward museums and museum educators on the part of those teachers involved. It is less clear why those teachers with more education and more teaching experience agree more strongly with the statement that museum visits are integral elements of their curriculum than the rest of the sample.

Factor Analysis

The t-test and Chi Square procedures reveal how predetermined subgroups within a sample compare to each other and to the statistically established norm. Factor analysis, on the other hand, identifies statistically what factors influence the sample responses. In this instance, through analysis of the factors, one should be able to describe more specifically those teacher attitudes measured by the survey instrument.

Statisticians recommend that ideal factor analysis utilize a sample size ten times the number of items on the instrument (10 times 25 items = 250). The sample size for this study falls well below these ideal conditions and therefore one's conclusions must be considered quite tentative.

The factor analysis procedure statistically identified five factors within the data. Table 6 displays the survey items with loadings (regression weights) greater than 40.* Table 7, the factor intercorrelation matrix, reveals that no one factor has a high enough correlation with any other factor to be combined. The factors, as identified by the factor analysis procedure, do not share enough in common with each other to establish distinct factors (attitudes) within the larger attitudes measured by the survey. Ideally, the factor analysis might have revealed a strong influence of one factor such as museum education staff on the teachers' attitudes. In fact, perhaps because of the small sample size, the factor analysis procedure does not identify any such distinct factors within the data. In Table 8 I have listed each item with a loading above 40 by factor and assigned a label to that factor. The vagueness of the factor names indicates that the factors are not especially distinct and therefore not very meaningful.

Table 9 represents the reliability of each of the five factors. Factor 2 and 5 appear to require additional items before they can be used confidently for comparison. Factors 1, 3, and 4 seem to be moderately reliable and therefore were subjected to further analysis. T-tests

---

*40 is used as the base figure because loadings lower than that explain little of the variance of the items. Further analysis of these items is thus not warranted.

Table 6

Factor Pattern Matrix*

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1		59			
2	-41b				
3					
4				-78	
5					44
6					79
7				-80	
8					
9					
10					61
11				-69	
12	51				
13					
14	76				
15			83b		
16					
17			54b		
18		81			
19			75b		
20		70			

Table 6 (continued)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
21					
22	69				
23	-42a		48b		
24	78				
25					

*All entires X 100. Only loadings greater than 40 have been presented for ease of interpretation.

a/ Assigned to factor 3.

b/ These items are reverse scored for the factor analysis

Table 7

Factor Intercorrelation Matrix

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Factor 1	1.000				
Factor 2	0.013	1.000			
Factor 3	-0.183	0.069	1.000		
Factor 4	-0.209	-0.193	0.025	1.000	
Factor 5	0.059	0.139	-0.086	-0.118	1.000

Table 8

Factor Labels

FACTOR 1	Student gains achieved through museum visits	
24.	A museum visit helps high school students to like history.	78
14.	Students practice valuable analytical skills working with historical objects and documents in museums.	76
22.	Museum visits provide students with a sense of their place in history.	69
12.	Museum school tours offer valuable learning experiences not available in the classroom.	51
2.	Museum visits require more time and effort on my part than they are worth educationally for my students.	41*
FACTOR 2	Student roles during museum visits	
18.	Student participation in "hands-on" activities at the museum is essential for learning.	81
20.	It is important to hold students responsible for information gained on a museum trip.	70
1.	Cooperative planning with the museum education staff is essential for an educationally valuable class visit to a museum.	59
FACTOR 3	The educational value of museum visits as activities for high school students	
15.	Museum visits are more valuable educationally for slower students than more able students.	83*
19.	Museum visits are educationally more valuable for elementary than high school students.	75*
17.	Time spent by high school students on a museum visit would be better spent in class.	54*
23.	The content of museum school tours is not interesting to high school students.	48*

Table 8 (continued)

FACTOR 4	Teacher perceptions of museum education staff	
7.	Museum education staff members are willing to help me in planning my class's visit to a museum.	80
4.	Museum education staff members are aware of my needs as a classroom teacher.	78
11.	Museum education staff members encourage high school class visits.	69
FACTOR 5	Extra efforts that improve museum visits	
6.	A visit by me to the museum before the class trip increases the educational value of the trip for my students.	79
10.	A follow-up activity for my students is an essential element of a successful museum visit.	61
5.	A visit to my classroom by museum staff before the museum visit improves the museum visit.	44

*Items are reversed scored.

Table 9

Factor Reliability

Factor	Items	Possible Score Range	Mean[b]	SD	Reliability
Factor 1	2a, 12, 14 22, 24	5-25	11.83	3.46	.78
Factor 2	1, 18, 20	3-15	6.53	2.17	.60
Factor 3	15a, 17a, 19a, 23a	4-20	9.80	2.90	.67
Factor 4	4, 7, 11	3-15	7.93	2.23	.79
Factor 5	5, 6, 10	3-15	6.12	1.80	.57

a Items reversed scored.

b Note that magnitude of means reflects the number of items within each factor. Readers should not make comparisons of means across factors.

were applied to these three factors to determine if they are in fact distinct elements of the sample. The absence of any statistical significance on the t-tests (see Table 10) reconfirms that these three factors are not very distinct from one another.

The factor analysis procedures add little to our understanding of the survey results. Increasing the sample size or adding more items to the instrument might clarify the factors and further define the attitudes measured by the survey. The Chi Square and t-test results suggest at least two interesting conclusions that will be further discussed in the final chapter.

Table 10

Factor t-tests

	Number of Responses	Mean	SD	T
Factor 1				
Experience (2-10)	30	11.87	3.65	.17
Experience (+10)	49	11.73	3.30	
Factor 3				
Experience (2-10)	30	9.67	2.44	-.16
Experience (+10)	49	9.78	3.16	
Factor 4				
Experience (2-10)	30	8.67	1.80	1.14
Experience (+10)	49	7.67	2.48	
Factor 1				
US History Teacher	48	12.02	3.70	.61
Other SS Teacher	33	11.54	3.10	
Factor 3				
US History Teacher	48	9.69	2.74	-.43
Other SS Teacher	33	9.97	3.15	
Factor 4				
US History Teacher	48	7.92	2.51	-.04
Other SS Teacher	33	7.94	1.80	
Factor 1				
OSV user	19	10.16	2.95	-2.48
Non-user	62	12.34	3.46	

Table 10 (continued)

	Number of Responses	Mean	SD	T
Factor 3				
OSV user	19	8.95	3.10	-1.48
Non-user	62	10.06	2.80	
Factor 4				
OSV user	19	6.63	2.09	-3.03
Non-user	62	8.32	2.14	
Factor 1				
BA/S	18	12.22	4.18	.96
+MA/S	45	11.33	2.91	
Factor 3				
BA/S	18	10.05	2.39	.93
+MA/S	45	9.29	3.16	
Factor 4				
BA/S	18	8.72	1.92	1.88
+MA/S	45	7.49	2.48	
Factor 1				
Junior High	12	10.58	2.15	-1.36
Senior High	69	12.04	3.60	
Factor 3				
Junior High	12	9.92	2.75	.15
Senior High	69	9.78	2.94	
Factor 4				
Junior High	12	7.67	1.83	-.43
Senior High	69	7.97	2.30	

Chapter 5

This paper has established that we know very little of high school teachers' attitudes toward museum education experiences. What research exists has focused on the effectiveness of elementary tours. Social studies literature has virtually ignored the subject. Today high school teachers and their students stand on the periphery of the museum audience. The results of this attitude survey provide some reasons for this situation.

The survey findings suggest the failure of high school social studies teachers to recognize and utilize the services of museum educators. While the teachers acknowledge the value of cooperative planning with museum personnel, their responses to the following survey statements about museum educators cluster around "uncertain:"

(4) Museum education staff are aware of my needs...

(5) ...a visit to my classroom by museum staff... improves the museum visit.

(7) ...staff members are willing to help me...

(11) ...staff encourage high school class visits.

(25) Museum guides use effective teaching techniques...

The teachers do not indicate a strong desire to work with museum staff, nor do they view museum educators as professionals who share common interests and concerns.

Section two of the survey specifically sought to identify high school teachers' attitudes toward learning in museums. The surveyed teachers reveal a limited understanding of the pedagogical value of museum visits. They do agree that museums offer valuable learning experiences not available in school classrooms, and their agreement with the statement that museums provide students with a sense of history suggests that they attach some special value to museums in the affective domain. However, the teachers express some doubt about the museum's influence in the cognitive domain. They seem uncertain about the value of "hands-on" experiences in museums, and the museum's role in developing students' analytical skills. These attitudes are consistent with the impressions gained from social studies literature reviewed elsewhere in this paper. Teachers seem to perceive museums as nice places to visit, but as poor places in which to learn. Along with these general comments, several more specific conclusions seem justified by the survey results.

Writers of museum literature blame the high school schedule as an obstacle to museum visits. The teachers contradict that assumption. Over half of the teachers took exception to the statement that the school schedule prevents trips to museums. One might conclude that high school teachers are indeed able to interrupt their schedules to pursue alternate activities, but need museum educators to give them better reasons to alter those schedules. The

responses to those teachers involved with programs at Old Sturbridge Village further support this conclusion.

Old Sturbridge Village has placed special emphasis on teachers as an audience since 1971. In 1977 the Village, with the financial support of the National Endowment for the Humanities, expanded its programs for high school teachers and students. Up to that time, 10% of the Village's school visitors were high school students.[29] With the aid of the N.E.H. grant, the Village's museum education staff worked closely with high school teachers to plan and implement special programs for adolescents closely linking the schools and the Village.

The survey responses of those teachers who have worked with the Sturbridge programs offer some heartening contrasts to the overall sample results. They reveal that those teachers are more aware of the professional roles of museum educators. They believe museum educators are sensitive to their needs as teachers and that museum guides use effective teaching techniques. Those teachers associated with Sturbridge seem to have a better sense of the roles of museum educators and of the educational potential of museum visits for their students. Their responses mildly suggest that they recognize the value of museum visits for high school students particularly in the affective domain, an area of special emphasis within the Sturbridge high school programs. One can assume that the efforts of the Village's museum education staff positively affected these teachers' attitudes.

Future Research

Pilot studies like this one may raise more questions than they answer. Certainly the results discussed here are preliminary and most tentative. They do suggest the following areas for further study:

1. Museum educators need to define more precisely the characteristics of high school teachers who use museums as learning sites for their students. Which teachers take the time and effort to bring high school students to museums? Why do those teachers with more experience and with more formal education respond more positively to the survey statement that museum visits are integral elements of their curriculum? Does this response pattern suggest that more experienced teachers are an especially receptive audience for museum programs? If museum euccators can better identify the qualities of those teachers who use their facilities, they can build programs to meet their particular interests and needs. Likewise, museums can better evaluate their programs in terms of non-participating teachers and, perhaps, change accordingly.
2. Museum personnel must offer more concrete evidence that museum visits provide significant learning experiences for high school students.

Simply recognizing that museums are nice places to visit is not adequate justification for support from school systems caught between declining budgets and rising costs. Museum educators must seek to clarify and quantify how museum visits affect children.

3. Museum educators must make their interest in and commitment to high school teachers and students more positive. It remains unclear whether museum educators do in fact encourage high school users. While this study has examined high school teachers' perceptions of museums, future studies must examine the other side of those perceptions: how do museum educators view high school teachers?[30]

* * * * *

The Old Sturbridge Village experience with high school programs provides encouragement for museums seeking to improve and expand educational programs for high school teachers and students. Cooperation between museum education staff and classroom teachers appears to lead to more positive attitudes toward museums on the part of teachers. If the Village's success is to be duplicated, museum educators must invite teachers to share ideas and to plan programs for students, in Museum Education Director

Alberta Sebolt's terms: "to build collaboratives."[31] To begin this process, both groups--museum educators and high school teachers--must become more aware of one another's professional needs and pedagogical interests.

In the winter of 1979, Museum News agreed to publish an article based on Sturbridge's high school programs and the results of this study.[32] As a direct result of that article, Sturbridge has received twenty-five requests for additional information on their high school programs and the Northeast Museums Conference of the American Association of Museums has asked this researcher and Peter O'Connell of the Village staff to participate in a panel discussion, "Developing the High School Audience," for its 1980 annual meeting. Such positive responses to these efforts offer hope that in the future museums may better serve high school teachers and students.

Footnotes

[1]Edward P. Alexander, Museums in Motion (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1979), p. 11.

[2]Grace Fisher Ramsey, Educational Work in Museums of the United States (New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1938), p. 45.

[3]Ibid., p. 60.

[4]Ibid., p. 57.

[5]Elisabeth Jane Merrill, "Educational Work in an Art Museum," The Museum News 18 (October, 1940): 12.

[6]Thomas Munro, "The Art Museum and the Secondary Schools," The Museum News 23 (March, 1946): 6.

[7]Ann P. Bay, Museum Programs for Young People (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1973), p. 239.

[8]U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, The Education of Adolescents (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. v.

[9]Ibid., p. 8.

[10]American Council for the Arts in Education, Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts in Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977), p. 242.

[11]Ibid., p. 148.

[12]American Association of Museums, Report: Phase Two Complete Museums and Education: Curriculum; Final Conference Report (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 135 685, 1976), p. 3.

[13]Aalbert Heine, Museums and the Teacher (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 146 077, 1977), p. 2.

[14]Richard Grove, "Some Problems in Museum Education," Museums and Education (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1968), p. 82.

[15]Adele Z. Silver and Barbara Y. Newsom, The Art Museum as Educator (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), p. 466.

[16]Ibid., p. 400.

[17]Ibid., p. 466.

[18]Ibid., p. 467.

[19]James Rath and James Fanning, A Study of the Attitudes of Nine Reference Groups Within the Lower Merion Schools District Toward Selected Social Studies Curriculum Activities (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Serivce, ED 059 924, 1971), p. 15.

[20]John Guenter, The Importance of Specific Skills to High School Social Studies Teachers (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 077 822, 1973), p. 6.

[21]Gregory Rhodes and Victor A. Smith, Inservice Needs Assessment: Social Studies Teachers in Indiana (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 125 967, 1975), p. 10.

[22]Ibid., p. 15.

[23]Benjamin Cox and Byron Massialas, Inquiry in Social Studies (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 222.

[24]Ruth West, Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Studies Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1938 (Cambridge, Mass.: NCSS, 1938), p. iii.

[25]Edward Olsen, "Acquainting the Teacher with the Community," Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Stuides Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1938 (Cambridge, Mass.: NCSS, 1938), p. 45.

[26]Helen Halter, "Educating Teachers for Community-Centered Social Studies," Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Studies Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1938 (Cambridge, Mass.: NCSS, 1938), p. 29.

[27]Henry Atyeo, "The Excursion in Social Education," Audio-Visual Materials and Methods in the Social Studies Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1947 (Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1947), p. 49.

[28]Ella Hawkinson, "Museums, Schools, and Community Cooperation," Audio-Visual Materials and Methods in the Social Studies Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, 1947 (Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1947), p. 68.

[29]Peter S. O'Connell, "Museums and High School Students," Old Sturbridge Village, April 1979.

[30]See Peter O'Connell's "Museums and High School Students" for a summary of the findings of a 1978 survey of museum educators' attitudes towards high school programs in museums. It includes some evidence of museum educators' attitudes toward high school teachers.

[31]Alberta P. Sebolt, interview, Washington, D.C., February 1980.

[32]Peter S. O'Connell and Mary Alexander, "Reaching the High School Audience," Museum News 58 (November/December 1979): 50-56.

Bibliography

This researcher carefully surveyed the publications of two organizations for this paper. To gain a sense of the museum literature relating to high schools, I reviewed the American Association of Museums' Annual Reports (1925-1958) and Museum News (1940-1978). I also reviewed the following publications of the National Council for the Social Studies, Social Education (1937-1978), the Annual Yearbooks, and the How To Do It Series.

Alexander, Edward P. Museums in Motion. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1979.

_____. The Interpretation Program of Colonial Williamsburg. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1971.

American Association of Museums. America's Museums: The Belmont Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1969.

_____. Museums: Their New Audiences. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1972.

_____. Report: Phase Two Complete Museums and Education: Curriculum; Final Conference Report. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 135 685, 1976.

American Council for the Arts in Education. Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts in Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Atyeo, Henry C. The Excursion as a Teaching Technique. New York: Columbia University, 1939.

Bay, Ann P. Museum Programs for Young People. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1973.

Bloomberg, Marguerite. An Experiment in Museum Instruction. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 044 921, 1971.

Cordier, Ralph W. "The Study of History Through State and Local Resources," Social Studies 60 (March 1969): 99-104.

DuTerroil, Anna. Museum Education: Recent Trends in Learning Environments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 113 229, 1976.

Gibson, Katherine. "An Experiment in Measuring Results of Fifth Grade Class Visits to an Art Museum," School and Society, May 30, 1925, pp. 658-662.

Guenter, John. The Importance of Specific Skills to High School Social Studies Teachers. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 077 822, 1973.

Heine, Aalbert. Museums and the Teacher. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 146 077, 1977.

Larrabee, Eric, ed. Museums and Education. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1968.

Lindemer, George C. "Historical Museums for Educational Enrichment," Social Studies 62 (November 1971): 258-261.

National Council for the Social Studies Publications:

Utilization of Community Resources in the Social Studies, Ninth Yearbook. Cambridge, Mass.: NCSS, 1938.

Audio-Visual Materials and Methods in the Social Studies, Eighteenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1947.

Skills in the Social Studies, Twenty-fourth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1953.

Interpreting and Teaching American History, Thirty-first Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1961.

Skill Development in the Social Studies, Thirty-third Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1963.

"How to Use Local History," How To Do It Series #3. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1966.

"How to Conduct a Field Trip," How To Do It Series #12. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1967.

"How to Utilize Community Resources," How To Do It Series #13. Washington, D.C.: NCSS, 1967.

National Education Association. Teaching the Social Studies: What Research Says to the Teacher. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 083 082, 1968.

Newsom, Barbara Y. and Silver, Adele Z., eds. The Art Museum as Educator. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978.

Ramsey, Grace Fisher. Educational Work in Museums of the United States. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1938.

Rath, James and Fanning, James. A Study of the Attitudes of Nine Reference Groups Within the Lower Merion Schools District Toward Selected Social Studies Curriculum Activities. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 059 924, 1971.

Rhodes, Gregory and Smith, Victor A. Inservice Needs Assessment: Social Studies Teachers in Indiana. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 125 967, 1975.

Social Studies Methods Textbooks:

Beyer, Barry K. Inquiry in the Social Studies Classroom: A Strategy for Teaching. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

Brubaker, Dale L. Secondary Social Studies for the 70's: Planning for Instruction. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973.

Cox, Benjamin C. and Massialas, Byron G. Inquiry in Social Studies. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Feldman, Martin and Seifman, Eli. The Social Studies: Structure, Models and Strategies. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Fraser, Dorothy McClure and West, Edith. Social Studies in Secondary Schools. New York: The Ronald Press, 1961.

Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Lawrence E. Teaching High School Social Studies. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955.

Johnson, Henry. Teaching of History. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.

Moffatt, Maurice P. Social Studies Instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Wesley, Edgar Bruce. Teaching the Social Studies. Boston: D.C. Heath & Company, 1942.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Education of Adolescents. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Wittlin, Alma S. Museums: In Search of a Usable Future. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1970.

Appendix A

Item # 1		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	13	13	1	3	0	30
	%	43.3	43.3	3.3	10.0	0	38.5
Hi	#	21	20	4	3	0	48
	%	43.8	41.7	8.3	6.3	0	61.5
Totals	#	34	33	5	6	0	78
	%	43.6	42.3	6.4	7.7	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.07 df = 3 p = .78

Item #2		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	2	0	6	15	7	30
	%	6.7	0.0	20.0	50.0	23.3	39.0
Hi	#	4	6	6	24	7	47
	%	8.5	12.8	12.8	51.1	14.9	61.0
Totals	#	6	6	12	39	14	77
	%	7.8	7.8	15.6	50.6	18.2	100.0

Chi Square = 5.24 df = 4 p = .26

Item #3		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	15	15	0	0	0	30
	%	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	38.0
Hi	#	24	24	0	1	0	49
	%	49.0	49.0	0	2.0	0	62.0
Totals	#	39	39	0	1	0	79
	%	49.4	49.4	0	1.3	0	100.0

Chi Square = 0.62 df = 2 p = .73

Item # 4		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	1	6	20	0	3	30
	%	3.3	20.0	66.7	0.0	10.0	39.0
Hi	#	2	12	22	8	3	47
	%	4.3	25.5	46.8	17.0	6.4	61.0
Totals	#	3	18	42	8	6	77
	%	3.9	23.4	54.5	10.4	7.8	100.0

Chi Square = 7.02 df = 4 p = .14

Item #5		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	2	6	18	4	0	30
	%	6.7	20.0	60.0	13.3	0	39.5
Hi	#	6	19	16	5	0	46
	%	13.0	41.3	34.8	10.9	0	60.5
Totals	#	8	25	34	9	0	76
	%	10.5	32.9	44.7	11.8	0	100.0

Chi Square = 5.88 df = 3 p = .12

Item #6		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	9	17	4	0	0	30
	%	30.0	56.7	13.3	0	0	38.0
Hi	#	22	23	2	1	1	49
	%	44.9	46.9	4.1	2.0	2.0	62.0
Totals	#	31	40	6	1	1	79
	%	39.2	50.6	7.6	1.3	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.72 df = 4 p = .32

Item #7		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	3	9	17	1	0	30
	%	10.0	30.0	56.7	3.3	0	39.0
Hi	#	5	18	21	3	0	47
	%	10.6	38.3	44.7	6.4	0	61.0
Totals	#	8	27	38	4	0	77
	%	10.4	35.1	49.4	5.2	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.23 df = 3 p = .75

Item #8		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	9	9	6	5	1	30
	%	30.0	30.0	20.0	16.7	3.3	38.0
Hi	#	27	12	4	6	0	49
	%	55.1	24.5	8.2	12.2	0	62.0
Totals	#	36	21	10	11	1	79
	%	45.6	26.6	12.7	13.9	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 6.74 df = 4 p = .15

Item #9		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	4	5	4	11	6	30
	%	13.3	16.7	13.3	36.7	20.0	39.0
Hi	#	8	13	2	21	3	47
	%	17.0	27.7	4.3	44.7	6.4	61.0
Totals	#	12	18	6	32	9	77
	%	15.6	23.4	7.8	41.6	11.7	100.0

Chi Square = 6.23 df = 4 p = .18

Item #10		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	5	21	2	2	0	30
	%	16.7	70.0	6.7	6.7	0	38.0
Hi	#	16	27	5	1	0	49
	%	32.7	55.1	10.2	2.0	0	62.0
Totals	#	21	48	7	3	0	79
	%	26.6	60.8	8.9	3.8	0	100.0

Chi Square = 3.78 df = 3 p = .29

Item #11		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	1	7	20	1	1	30
	%	3.3	23.3	66.7	3.3	3.3	38.5
Hi	#	5	16	24	3	0	48
	%	10.4	33.3	50.0	6.3	0	61.5
Totals	#	6	23	44	4	1	78
	%	7.7	29.5	56.4	5.1	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.64 df = 4 p = .32

Item #12		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	11	15	3	0	1	30
	%	36.7	50.0	10.0	0	3.3	38.0
Hi	#	23	22	4	0	0	49
	%	46.9	44.9	8.2	0	0	62.0
Totals	#	34	37	7	0	1	79
	%	43.0	46.8	8.9	0	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 2.26 df = 3 p = .52

Item #13		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	2	14	8	4	2	30
	%	6.7	46.7	26.7	13.3	6.7	38.0
Hi	#	5	22	11	10	1	49
	%	10.2	44.9	22.4	20.4	2.0	62.0
Totals	#	7	36	19	14	3	79
	%	8.9	45.6	24.1	17.7	3.8	100.0

Chi Square = 1.99 df = 4 p = .74

Item #14		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	0	13	9	5	1	28
	%	0	46.4	32.1	17.9	3.6	36.4
Hi	#	4	17	17	10	1	49
	%	8.2	34.7	34.7	20.4	2.0	63.6
Totals	#	4	30	26	15	2	77
	%	5.2	39.0	33.8	19.5	2.6	100.0

Chi Square = 3.17 df = 4 p = .53

Item #15		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	1	4	15	7	3	30
	%	3.3	13.3	50.0	23.3	10.0	38.0
Hi	#	3	9	13	15	9	49
	%	6.1	18.4	26.5	30.6	18.4	62.0
Totals	#	4	13	28	22	12	79
	%	5.1	16.5	35.4	27.8	15.2	100.0

Chi Square = 4.67 df = 4 p = .32

Item #16		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	0	3	9	15	3	30
	%	0	10.0	30.0	50.0	10.0	38.5
Hi	#	2	3	17	23	3	48
	%	4.2	6.3	35.4	47.9	6.3	61.5
Totals	#	2	6	26	38	6	78
	%	2.6	7.7	33.3	48.7	7.7	100.0

Chi Square = 2.10 df = 4 p = .72

Item #17		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	0	0	7	17	6	30
	%	0	0	23.3	56.7	20.0	38.5
Hi	#	1	5	7	23	12	48
	%	2.1	10.4	14.6	47.9	25.0	61.5
Totals	#	1	5	14	40	18	78
	%	1.3	6.4	17.9	51.3	23.1	100.0

Chi Square = 5.01 df = 4 p = .29

Item #18		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	5	15	7	3	0	30
	%	16.7	50.0	23.3	10.0	0	38.5
Hi	#	4	19	12	12	1	48
	%	8.3	39.6	25.0	25.0	2.1	61.5
Totals	#	9	34	19	15	1	78
	%	11.5	43.6	24.4	19.2	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.38 df = 4 p = .36

Item #19		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	0	1	15	10	4	30
	%	0	3.3	50.0	33.3	13.3	38.0
Hi	#	1	9	13	15	11	49
	%	2.0	18.4	26.5	30.6	22.4	62.0
Totals	#	1	10	28	25	15	79
	%	1.3	12.7	35.4	31.6	19.0	100.0

Chi Square = 7.68 df = 4 p = .10

Item #20		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	5	14	5	6	0	30
	%	16.7	46.7	16.7	20.0	0	38.0
Hi	#	8	29	5	5	2	49
	%	16.3	59.2	10.2	10.2	4.1	62.0
Totals	#	13	43	10	11	2	79
	%	16.5	54.4	12.7	13.9	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 3.66 df = 4 p = .45

Item #21		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	1	3	7	14	5	30
	%	3.3	10.0	23.3	46.7	16.7	41.1
Hi	#	1	10	9	19	4	43
	%	2.3	23.3	20.9	44.2	9.3	58.9
Totals	#	2	13	16	33	9	73
	%	2.7	17.8	21.9	45.2	12.3	100.0

Chi Square = 2.66 df = 4 p = .62

Item #22		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	1	13	14	1	1	30
	%	3.3	43.3	46.7	3.3	3.3	38.0
Hi	#	6	27	13	3	0	49
	%	12.2	55.1	26.5	6.1	0	62.0
Totals	#	7	40	27	4	1	79
	%	8.9	50.6	34.2	5.1	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 6.30 df = 4 p = .18

Item #23		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	0	3	11	12	4	30
	%	0	10.0	36.7	40.0	13.3	38.0
Hi	#	2	5	12	23	7	49
	%	4.1	10.2	24.5	46.9	14.3	62.0
Totals	#	2	8	23	35	11	79
	%	2.5	10.1	29.1	44.3	13.9	100.0

Chi Square = 2.39 df = 4 p = .66

Item #24		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
Low	#	2	10	15	2	1	30
	%	6.7	33.3	50.0	6.7	3.3	38.0
Hi	#	5	23	14	6	1	49
	%	10.2	46.9	28.6	12.2	2.0	62.0
Total	#	7	33	29	8	2	79
	%	8.9	41.8	36.7	10.1	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 4.11 df = 4 p = .39

Item #25		Responses					
Experience		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D	Total
Low	#	0	5	18	5	1	29
	%	0	17.2	62.1	17.2	3.4	38.7
Hi	#	1	13	24	8	0	46
	%	2.2	28.3	52.2	17.4	0	61.3
Totals	#	1	18	42	13	1	75
	%	1.3	24.0	56.0	17.3	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 3.43 df = 4 p = .49

Item #1		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D	Total
No	#	18	12	0	2	0	32
	%	56.3	37.5	0	6.3	0	40.0
Yes	#	18	21	5	4	0	48
	%	37.5	43.8	10.4	8.3	0	60.0
Totals	#	36	33	5	6	0	80
	%	45.0	41.3	6.3	7.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = 5.13 df = 3 p = .16

Item #2		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D	Total
No	#	2	4	5	15	6	32
	%	6.3	12.5	15.6	46.9	18.8	40.5
Yes	#	4	3	7	24	9	47
	%	8.5	6.4	14.9	51.1	19.1	59.5
Totals	#	6	7	12	39	15	79
	%	7.6	8.9	15.2	49.4	19.0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.01 df = 4 p = .91

Item #3		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	20	13	0	0	0	33
	%	60.6	39.4	0	0	0	40.7
Yes	#	20	27	0	1	0	48
	%	41.7	56.3	0	2.1	0	59.3
Totals	#	40	40	0	1	0	81
	%	49.4	49.4	0	1.2	0	100.0

Chi Square = 3.23 df = 2 p = .20

Item #4		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	7	20	3	2	33
	%	3.0	21.2	60.6	9.1	6.1	41.8
Yes	#	2	11	23	6	4	46
	%	4.3	23.9	50.0	13.0	8.7	58.2
Totals	#	3	18	43	9	6	79
	%	3.8	22.8	54.4	11.4	7.6	100.0

Chi Square = .98 df = 4 p = .91

Item #5		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	11	16	2	0	33
	%	12.1	33.3	48.5	6.1	0	42.3
Yes	#	5	14	19	7	0	45
	%	11.1	31.1	42.2	15.6	0	57.7
Totals	#	9	25	35	9	0	78
	%	11.5	32.1	44.9	11.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.70 df = 3 p = .64

Item #6		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	11	19	3	0	0	33
	%	33.3	57.6	9.1	0	0	40.7
Yes	#	21	22	3	1	1	48
	%	43.8	45.8	6.3	2.1	2.1	59.3
Totals	#	32	41	6	1	1	81
	%	39.5	50.6	7.4	1.2	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 2.66 df = 4 p = .62

Item #7		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	13	15	1	0	33
	%	12.1	39.4	45.5	3.0	0	41.8
Yes	#	4	15	24	3	0	46
	%	8.7	32.6	52.2	6.5	0	58.2
Totals	#	8	28	39	4	0	79
	%	10.1	35.4	49.4	5.1	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.11 df = 3 p = .77

Item #8		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	15	9	4	4	0	32
	%	46.9	28.1	12.5	12.5	0	40.0
Yes	#	21	12	6	8	1	48
	%	43.8	25.0	12.5	16.7	2.1	60.0
Totals	#	36	21	10	12	1	80
	%	45.0	26.3	12.5	15.0	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 1.00 df = 4 p = .91

Item #9		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	3	7	2	13	6	31
	%	9.7	22.6	6.5	41.9	19.4	39.2
Yes	#	9	11	4	20	4	48
	%	18.8	22.9	8.3	41.7	8.3	60.8
Totals	#	12	18	6	33	10	79
	%	15.2	22.8	7.6	41.8	12.7	100.0

Chi Square = 2.92 df = 4 p = .57

Item #10		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D	Total
No	#	8	21	3	1	0	33
	%	24.2	63.6	9.1	3.0	0	40.7
Yes	#	13	28	5	2	0	48
	%	27.1	58.3	10.4	4.2	0	59.3
Totals	#	21	49	8	3	0	81
	%	25.9	60.5	9.9	3.7	0	100.0

Chi Square = .25 df = 3 p = .97

Item #11		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	7	20	2	0	33
	%	12.1	21.2	60.6	6.1	0	41.3
Yes	#	2	17	24	3	1	47
	%	4.3	36.2	51.1	6.4	2.1	58.8
Total	#	6	24	44	5	1	80
	%	7.5	30.0	55.0	6.3	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.07 df = 4 p = .40

Item #12		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	17	12	4	0	0	33
	%	51.5	36.4	12.1	0	0	40.7
Yes	#	18	25	4	0	1	48
	%	37.5	52.1	8.3	0	2.1	59.3
Totals	#	35	37	8	0	1	81
	%	43.2	45.7	9.9	0	1.2	100.0
Chi Square = 2.92				df = 3		p = .40	

Item #13		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	3	14	8	6	2	33
	%	9.1	42.4	24.2	18.2	6.1	40.7
Yes	#	4	22	12	9	1	48
	%	8.3	45.8	25.0	18.8	2.1	59.3
Totals	#	7	36	20	15	3	81
	%	8.6	44.4	24.7	18.5	3.7	100.0
Chi Square = .90				df = 4		p = .92	

Item #14		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	12	12	6	0	31
	%	3.2	38.7	38.7	19.4	0	39.2
Yes	#	3	18	15	10	2	48
	%	6.3	37.5	31.3	20.8	4.2	60.8
Totals	#	4	30	27	16	2	79
	%	5.1	38.0	34.2	20.3	2.5	100.0
Chi Square = 1.97				df = 4		p = .74	

Item # 15		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	8	12	6	5	33
	%	6.1	24.2	36.4	18.2	15.2	40.7
Yes	#	2	5	18	16	7	48
	%	4.2	10.4	37.5	33.3	14.6	59.3
Totals	#	4	13	30	22	12	81
	%	4.9	16.0	37.0	27.2	14.8	100.0
Chi Square = 4.13				df = 4		p = .39	

Item #16		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	3	11	16	3	33
	%	0	9.1	33.3	48.5	9.1	41.3
Yes	#	2	3	16	23	3	47
	%	4.3	6.4	34.0	48.9	6.4	58.8
Totals	#	2	6	27	39	6	80
	%	2.5	7.5	33.8	48.8	7.5	100.0
Chi Square = 1.79				df = 4		p = .77	

Item #17		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D	Total
No	#	1	3	5	14	10	33
	%	3.0	9.1	15.2	42.4	30.3	41.3
Yes	#	0	2	10	26	9	47
	%	0	4.3	21.3	55.3	19.1	58.8
Totals	#	1	5	15	40	19	80
	%	1.3	6.3	18.8	50.0	23.8	100.0
Chi Square = 4.20				df = 4		p = .38	

Item #18		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	16	7	5	0	32
	%	12.5	50.0	21.9	15.6	0	40.0
Yes	#	6	19	12	10	1	48
	%	12.5	39.6	25.0	20.8	2.1	60.0
Totals	#	10	35	19	15	1	80
	%	12.5	43.8	23.8	13.8	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 1.50 df = 4 p = .83

Item #19		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	9	8	8	8	33
	%	0	27.3	24.2	24.2	24.2	40.7
Yes	#	1	2	20	17	8	48
	%	2.1	4.2	41.7	35.4	16.7	59.3
Total	#	1	11	28	25	16	81
	%	1.2	13.6	34.6	30.9	19.8	100.0

Chi Square = 11.45 df = 4 p = .02

Item #20		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	20	4	3	0	33
	%	18.2	60.6	12.1	9.1	0	40.7
Yes	#	8	24	6	8	2	48
	%	16.7	50.0	12.5	16.7	4.2	59.3
Totals	#	14	44	10	11	2	81
	%	17.3	54.3	12.3	13.6	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 2.63 df = 4 p = .62

Item #21		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	6	5	15	3	30
	%	3.3	20.0	16.7	50.0	10.0	40.0
Yes	#	1	8	11	19	6	45
	%	2.2	17.8	24.4	42.2	13.3	60.0
Totals	#	2	14	16	34	9	75
	%	2.7	18.7	21.3	45.3	12.0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.05 df = 4 p = .90

Item #22		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	19	10	2	0	33
	%	6.1	57.6	30.3	6.1	0	40.7
Yes	#	5	22	18	2	1	48
	%	10.4	45.8	37.5	4.2	2.1	59.3
Totals	#	7	41	28	4	1	81
	%	8.6	50.6	34.6	4.9	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 2.08 df = 4 p = .72

Item #23		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	4	8	14	6	32
	%	0	12.5	25.0	43.8	18.8	40.0
Yes	#	2	5	15	21	5	48
	%	4.2	10.4	31.3	43.8	10.4	60.0
Totals	#	2	9	23	35	11	80
	%	2.5	11.3	28.8	43.8	13.8	100.0

Chi Square = 2.64 df = 4 p = .62

Item #24		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	18	8	5	0	33
	%	6.1	54.5	24.2	15.2	0	40.7
Yes	#	5	16	21	4	2	48
	%	10.4	33.3	43.8	8.3	4.2	59.3
Totals	#	7	34	29	9	2	81
	%	8.6	42.0	35.8	11.1	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 6.80 df = 4 p = .15

Item #25		Responses					
Teach US history?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	7	16	6	1	30
	%	0	23.3	53.3	20.0	3.3	39.5
Yes	#	1	11	26	8	0	46
	%	2.2	23.9	56.5	17.4	0	60.5
Totals	#	1	18	42	14	1	76
	%	1.3	23.7	55.3	18.4	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 2.29 df = 4 p = .68

Item #1		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	10	8	0	0	0	18
	%	55.6	44.4	0	0	0	29.0
MA+	#	20	16	4	4	0	44
	%	45.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	0	71.0
Totals	#	30	24	4	4	0	62
	%	48.4	38.7	6.5	6.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = 3.76 df = 3 p = .29

Item # 2		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	1	1	4	8	4	18
	%	5.6	5.6	22.2	44.4	22.2	29.0
MA+	#	3	4	4	26	7	44
	%	6.8	9.1	9.1	59.1	15.9	71.0
Totals	#	4	5	8	34	11	62
	%	6.5	8.1	12.9	54.8	17.7	100.0

Chi Square = 2.72 df = 4 p = .60

Item #3		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	12	6	0	0	0	18
	%	66.7	33.3	0	0	0	28.6
MA+	#	23	21	0	1	0	45
	%	51.1	46.7	0	2.2	0	71.4
Totals	#	35	27	0	1	0	63
	%	55.6	42.9	0	1.6	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.49 df = 2 p = .47

Item #4		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	1	1	14	1	1	18
	%	5.6	5.6	77.8	5.6	5.6	29.5
MA+	#	2	13	19	5	4	43
	%	4.7	30.2	44.2	11.6	9.3	70.5
Totals	#	3	14	33	6	5	61
	%	4.9	23.0	54.1	9.8	8.2	100.0

Chi Square = 6.73 df = 4 p = .15

Item #5		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	2	4	12	0	0	18
	%	11.1	22.2	66.7	0	0	30.0
MA+	#	5	13	17	7	0	42
	%	11.9	31.0	40.5	16.7	0	70.0
Totals	#	7	17	29	7	0	60
	%	11.7	28.3	48.3	11.7	0	100.0
Chi Square = 5.13			df = 3			p = .16	

Item #6		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	8	9	1	0	0	18
	%	44.4	50.0	5.6	0	0	28.6
MA+	#	19	20	4	1	1	45
	%	42.2	44.4	8.9	2.2	2.2	71.4
Totals	#	27	29	5	1	1	63
	%	42.9	46.0	7.9	1.6	1.6	100.0
Chi Square = 1.08			df = 4			p = .90	

Item #7		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	3	1	13	1	0	18
	%	16.7	5.6	72.2	5.6	0	29.5
MA+	#	4	20	16	3	0	43
	%	9.3	46.5	37.2	7.0	0	70.5
Totals	#	7	21	29	4	0	61
	%	11.5	34.4	47.5	6.6	0	100.0
Chi Square = 10.09			df = 3			p = .02	

Item #8		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	7	5	3	3	0	18
	%	38.9	27.8	16.7	16.7	0	28.6
MA+	#	22	12	5	6	0	45
	%	48.9	26.7	11.1	13.3	0	71.4
Totals	#	29	17	8	9	0	63
	%	46.0	27.0	12.7	14.3	0	100.0
Chi Square = .70			df = 3			p = .87	

Item #9		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	3	4	2	5	4	18
	%	16.7	22.2	11.1	27.8	22.2	29.0
MA+	#	7	10	1	22	4	44
	%	15.9	22.7	2.3	50.0	9.1	71.0
Totals	#	10	14	3	27	8	62
	%	16.1	22.6	4.8	43.5	12.9	100.0
Chi Square = 5.22			df = 4			p = .26	

Item #10		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	4	12	2	0	0	18
	%	22.2	66.7	11.1	0	0	28.6
MA+	#	13	26	4	2	0	45
	%	28.9	57.8	8.9	4.4	0	71.4
Totals	#	17	38	6	2	0	63
	%	27.0	60.3	9.5	3.2	0	100.0
Chi Square = 1.25			df = 3			p = .74	

Item #11		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	2	14	1	1	18
	%	0	11.1	77.8	5.6	5.6	29.0
MA+	#	5	17	19	3	0	44
	%	11.4	38.6	43.2	6.8	0	71.0
Totals	#	5	19	33	4	1	62
	%	8.1	30.6	53.2	6.5	1.6	100.0

Chi Square = 10.55 df = 4 p = .03

Item #12		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	7	6	4	0	1	18
	%	38.9	33.3	22.2	0	5.6	28.6
MA+	#	22	22	1	0	0	45
	%	48.9	48.9	2.2	0	0	71.4
Totals	#	29	28	5	0	1	63
	%	46.0	44.4	7.9	0	1.6	100.0

Chi Square = 9.96 df = 3 p = .02

Item #13		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	2	7	5	4	0	18
	%	11.1	38.9	27.8	22.2	0	28.6
MA+	#	3	19	12	9	2	45
	%	6.7	42.2	26.7	20.0	4.4	71.4
Totals	#	5	26	17	13	2	63
	%	7.9	41.3	27.0	20.6	3.2	100.0

Chi Square = 1.19 df = 4 p = .88

Item #14		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	8	6	2	1	17
	%	0	47.1	35.3	11.8	5.9	27.4
MA+	#	4	17	15	8	1	45
	%	8.9	37.8	33.3	17.8	2.2	72.6
Totals	#	4	25	21	10	2	62
	%	6.5	40.3	33.9	16.1	3.2	100.0

Chi Square = 2.58 df = 4 p = .63

Item #15		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	3	8	6	1	18
	%	0	16.7	44.4	33.3	5.6	28.6
MA+	#	3	6	13	12	11	45
	%	6.7	13.3	28.9	26.7	24.4	71.4
Totals	#	3	9	21	18	12	63
	%	4.8	14.3	33.3	28.6	19.0	100.0

Chi Square = 4.84 df = 4 p = .30

Item #16		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	2	8	7	1	18
	%	0	11.1	44.4	38.9	5.6	29.0
MA+	#	1	1	15	23	4	44
	%	2.3	2.3	34.1	52.3	9.1	71.0
Totals	#	1	3	23	30	5	62
	%	1.6	4.8	37.1	48.4	8.1	100.0

Chi Square = 3.51 df = 4 p = .48

Item #17		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	1	6	10	1	18
	%	0	5.6	33.3	55.6	5.6	29.0
MA+	#	0	2	6	23	13	44
	%	0	4.5	13.6	52.3	29.5	71.0
Totals	#	0	3	12	33	14	62
	%	0	4.8	19.4	53.2	22.6	100.0

Chi Square = 5.87 df = 3 p = .12

Item #18		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	4	10	3	1	0	18
	%	22.2	55.6	16.7	5.6	0	28.6
MA+	#	4	18	10	12	1	45
	%	8.9	40.0	22.2	26.7	2.2	71.4
Totals	#	8	28	13	13	1	63
	%	12.7	44.4	20.6	20.6	1.6	100.0

Chi Square = 5.87 df = 4 p = .21

Item #19		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	1	9	7	1	18
	%	0	5.6	50.0	38.9	5.6	28.6
MA+	#	1	7	12	14	11	45
	%	2.2	15.6	26.7	31.1	24.4	71.4
Totals	#	1	8	21	21	12	63
	%	1.6	12.7	33.3	33.3	19.0	100.0

Chi Square = 6.15 df = 4 p = .19

Item #20		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	1	9	6	2	0	18
	%	5.6	50.0	33.3	11.1	0	28.6
MA+	#	10	25	4	5	1	45
	%	22.2	55.6	8.9	11.1	2.2	71.4
Totals	#	11	34	10	7	1	63
	%	17.5	54.0	15.9	11.1	1.6	100.0

Chi Square = 7.36 df = 4 p = .12

Item #21		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	1	3	10	4	18
	%	0	5.6	16.7	55.6	22.2	31.0
MA+	#	2	9	11	14	4	40
	%	5.0	22.5	27.5	35.0	10.0	69.0
Totals	#	2	10	14	24	8	58
	%	3.4	17.2	24.1	41.4	13.8	100.0

Chi Square = 6.18 df = 4 p = .18

Item #22		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	11	6	0	1	18
	%	0	61.1	33.3	0	5.6	28.6
MA+	#	6	21	16	2	0	45
	%	13.3	46.7	35.6	4.4	0	71.4
Totals	#	6	32	22	2	1	63
	%	9.5	50.8	34.9	3.2	1.6	100.0

Chi Square = 6.25 df = 4 p = .18

Item #23		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	1	7	8	2	18
	%	0	5.6	38.9	44.4	11.1	28.6
MA+	#	2	4	10	21	8	45
	%	4.4	8.9	22.2	46.7	17.8	71.4
Totals	#	2	5	17	29	10	63
	%	3.2	7.9	27.0	46.0	15.9	100.0
Chi Square = 2.68				df = 4		p = .61	

Item #24		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	1	6	7	3	1	18
	%	5.6	33.3	38.9	16.7	5.6	28.6
MA+	#	5	21	15	3	1	45
	%	11.1	46.7	33.3	6.7	2.2	71.4
Totals	#	6	27	22	6	2	63
	%	9.5	42.9	34.9	9.5	3.2	100.0
Chi Square = 2.86				df = 4		p = .58	

Item #25		Responses					
Degree		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
BA/S	#	0	4	11	2	0	17
	%	0	23.5	64.7	11.8	0	28.8
MA+	#	0	11	23	8	0	42
	%	0	26.2	54.8	19.0	0	71.2
Totals	#	0	15	34	10	0	59
	%	0	25.4	57.6	16.9	0	100.0
Chi Square = .62				df = 2		p = .73	

Item #1		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	29	26	4	3	0	62
	%	46.8	41.9	6.5	4.8	0	77.5
Yes	#	7	7	1	3	0	18
	%	38.9	38.9	5.6	16.7	0	22.5
Totals	#	36	33	5	6	0	80
	%	45.0	41.3	6.3	7.5	0	100.0
Chi Square = 2.84				df = 3		p = .42	

Item #2		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	6	10	31	9	60
	%	6.7	10.0	16.7	51.7	15.0	75.9
Yes	#	2	1	2	8	6	19
	%	10.5	5.3	10.5	42.1	31.6	24.1
Totals	#	6	7	12	39	15	79
	%	7.6	8.9	15.2	49.4	19.0	100.0
Chi Square = 3.36				df = 4		p = .50	

Item #3		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	30	31	0	1	0	62
	%	48.4	50.0	0	1.6	0	76.5
Yes	#	10	9	0	0	0	19
	%	52.6	47.4	0	0	0	23.5
Totals	#	40	40	0	1	0	81
	%	49.4	49.4	0	1.2	0	100.0
Chi Square = .38				df = 2		p = .83	

Item #4		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	9	38	7	6	60
	%	0	15.0	63.3	11.7	10.0	75.9
Yes	#	3	9	5	2	0	19
	%	15.8	47.4	26.3	10.5	0	24.1
Totals	#	3	18	43	9	6	79
	%	3.8	22.8	54.4	11.4	7.6	100.0

Chi Square = 21.66 df = 4 p = .0002

Item #5		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	19	28	7	0	60
	%	10.0	31.7	46.7	11.7	0	76.9
Yes	#	3	6	7	2	0	18
	%	16.7	33.3	38.9	11.1	0	23.1
Totals	#	9	25	35	9	0	78
	%	11.5	32.1	44.9	11.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = .73 df = 3 p = .86

Item #6		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	21	34	6	1	0	62
	%	33.9	54.8	9.7	1.6	0	76.5
Yes	#	11	7	0	0	1	19
	%	57.9	36.8	0	0	5.3	23.5
Totals	#	32	41	6	1	1	81
	%	39.5	50.6	7.4	1.2	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 8.46 df = 4 p = .08

Item #7		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	20	34	2	0	60
	%	6.7	33.3	56.7	3.3	0	75.9
Yes	#	4	8	5	2	0	19
	%	21.1	42.1	26.3	10.5	0	24.1
Totals	#	8	28	39	4	0	79
	%	10.1	35.4	49.4	5.1	0	100.0

Chi Square = 7.43 df = 3 p = .06

Item #8		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	31	16	8	6	1	62
	%	50.0	25.8	12.9	9.7	1.6	77.5
Yes	#	5	5	2	6	0	18
	%	27.8	27.8	11.1	33.3	0	22.5
Totals	#	36	21	10	12	1	80
	%	45.0	26.3	12.5	15.0	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 7.08 df = 4 p = .13

Item #9		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	10	14	6	25	6	61
	%	16.4	23.0	9.8	41.0	9.8	77.2
Yes	#	2	4	0	8	4	18
	%	11.1	22.2	0	44.4	22.2	22.8
Totals	#	12	18	6	33	10	79
	%	15.2	22.8	7.6	41.8	12.7	100.0

Chi Square = 3.75 df = 4 p = .44

Item #10		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	14	39	7	2	0	62
	%	22.6	62.9	11.3	3.2	0	76.5
Yes	#	7	10	1	1	0	19
	%	36.8	52.6	5.3	5.3	0	23.5
Totals	#	21	49	8	3	0	81
	%	25.9	60.5	9.9	3.7	0	100.0

Chi Square = 2.09 df = 3 p = .55

Item #11		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	15	40	4	1	61
	%	1.6	24.6	65.6	6.6	1.6	76.3
Yes	#	5	9	4	1	0	19
	%	26.3	47.4	21.1	5.3	0	23.8
Totals	#	6	24	44	5	1	80
	%	7.5	30.0	55.0	6.3	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 19.84 df = 4 p = .0005

Item #12		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	26	27	8	0	1	62
	%	41.9	43.5	12.9	0	1.6	76.5
Yes	#	9	10	0	0	0	19
	%	47.4	52.6	0	0	0	23.5
Totals	#	35	37	8	0	1	81
	%	43.2	45.7	9.9	0	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 3.12 df = 3 p = .37

Item #13		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	29	15	11	1	62
	%	9.7	46.8	24.2	17.7	1.6	76.5
Yes	#	1	7	5	4	2	19
	%	5.3	36.8	26.3	21.1	10.5	23.5
Totals	#	7	36	20	15	3	81
	%	8.6	44.4	24.7	18.5	3.7	100.0

Chi Square = 3.88 df = 4 p = .42

Item #14		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	24	20	14	2	61
	%	1.6	39.3	32.8	23.0	3.3	77.2
Yes	#	3	6	7	2	0	18
	%	16.7	33.3	38.9	11.1	0	22.8
Totals	#	4	30	27	16	2	79
	%	5.1	38.0	34.2	20.3	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 8.02 df = 4 p = .09

Item #15		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	12	21	18	7	62
	%	6.5	19.4	33.9	29.0	11.3	76.5
Yes	#	0	1	9	4	5	19
	%	0	5.3	47.4	21.1	26.3	23.5
Totals	#	4	13	30	22	12	81
	%	4.9	16.0	37.0	27.2	14.8	100.0

Chi Square = 6.30 df = 4 p = .18

Item #16		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	6	24	26	4	61
	%	1.6	9.8	39.3	42.6	6.6	76.3
Yes	#	1	0	3	13	2	19
	%	5.3	0	15.8	68.4	10.5	23.8
Totals	#	2	6	27	39	6	80
	%	2.5	7.5	33.8	48.8	7.5	100.0

Chi Square = 7.29 df = 4 p = .12

Item #17		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	0	5	14	29	13	61
	%	0	8.2	23.0	47.5	21.3	76.3
Yes	#	1	0	1	11	6	19
	%	5.3	0	5.3	57.9	31.6	23.8
Totals	#	1	5	15	40	19	80
	%	1.3	6.3	18.8	50.0	23.8	100.0

Chi Square = 8.14 df = 4 p = .09

Item #18		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	7	27	16	10	1	61
	%	11.5	44.3	26.2	16.4	1.6	76.3
Yes	#	3	8	3	5	0	19
	%	15.8	42.1	15.8	26.3	0	23.8
Totals	#	10	35	19	15	1	80
	%	12.5	43.8	23.8	18.8	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 1.97 df = 4 p = .74

Item #19		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	8	20	24	9	62
	%	1.6	12.9	32.3	38.7	14.5	76.5
Yes	#	0	3	8	1	7	19
	%	0	15.8	42.1	5.3	36.8	23.5
Totals	#	1	11	28	25	16	81
	%	1.2	13.6	34.6	30.9	19.8	100.0

Chi Square = 9.74 df = 4 p = .04

Item #20		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	11	34	8	8	1	62
	%	17.7	54.8	12.9	12.9	1.6	76.5
Yes	#	3	10	2	3	1	19
	%	15.8	52.6	10.5	15.8	5.3	23.5
Totals	#	14	44	10	11	2	81
	%	17.3	54.3	12.3	13.6	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = .98 df = 4 p = .91

Item #21		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	7	11	27	9	56
	%	3.6	12.5	19.6	48.2	16.1	74.7
Yes	#	0	7	5	7	0	19
	%	0	36.8	26.3	36.8	0	25.3
Totals	#	2	14	16	34	9	75
	%	2.7	18.7	21.3	45.3	12.0	100.0

Chi Square = 8.94 df = 4 p = .06

Item #22		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	31	24	4	1	62
	%	3.2	50.0	38.7	6.5	1.6	76.5
Yes	#	5	10	4	0	0	19
	%	26.3	52.6	21.1	0	0	23.5
Totals	#	7	41	28	4	1	81
	%	8.6	50.6	34.6	4.9	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 11.83 df = 4 p = .02

Item #23		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	6	21	27	6	62
	%	3.2	9.7	33.9	43.5	9.7	77.5
Yes	#	0	3	2	8	5	18
	%	0	16.7	11.1	44.4	27.8	22.5
Totals	#	2	9	23	35	11	80
	%	2.5	11.3	28.8	43.8	13.8	100.0

Chi Square = 7.03 df = 4 p = .13

Item #24		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	3	25	24	8	2	62
	%	4.8	40.3	38.7	12.9	3.2	76.5
Yes	#	4	9	5	1	0	19
	%	21.1	47.4	26.3	5.3	0	23.5
Totals	#	7	34	29	9	2	81
	%	8.6	42.0	35.8	11.1	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 6.60 df = 4 p = .16

Item #25		Responses					
Visit OSV?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	8	38	11	0	58
	%	1.7	13.8	65.5	19.0	0	76.3
Yes	#	0	10	4	3	1	18
	%	0	55.6	22.2	16.7	5.6	23.7
Totals	#	1	18	42	14	1	76
	%	1.3	23.7	55.3	18.4	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 18.35 df = 4 p = .001

Item #1		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	30	27	5	6	0	68
	%	44.1	39.7	7.4	8.8	0	85.0
Yes	#	6	6	0	0	0	12
	%	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	15.0
Totals	#	36	33	5	6	0	80
	%	45.0	41.3	6.3	7.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = 2.28 df = 3 p = .52

Item #2		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	6	10	35	10	67
	%	9.0	9.0	14.9	52.2	14.9	84.8
Yes	#	0	1	2	4	5	12
	%	0	8.3	16.7	3.3	41.7	15.2
Total	#	6	7	12	39	15	79
	%	7.6	8.9	15.2	49.4	19.0	100.0

Chi Square = 5.67 df = 4 p = .22

Item #3		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	32	36	0	1	0	69
	%	46.4	52.2	0	1.4	0	85.2
Yes	#	8	4	0	0	0	12
	%	66.7	33.3	0	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	40	40	0	1	0	81
	%	49.4	49.4	0	1.2	0	100.0

Chi Square = 1.76 df = 2 p = .41

Item #4		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	15	36	8	6	67
	%	3.0	22.4	53.7	11.9	9.0	84.8
Yes	#	1	3	7	1	0	12
	%	8.3	25.0	58.3	8.3	0	15.2
Totals	#	3	18	43	9	6	79
	%	3.8	22.8	54.4	11.4	7.6	100.0

Chi Square = 2.03 df = 4 p = .73

Item #5		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	23	29	8	0	66
	%	9.1	34.8	43.9	12.1	0	84.6
Yes	#	3	2	6	1	0	12
	%	25.0	16.7	50.0	8.3	0	15.4
Totals	#	9	25	35	9	0	78
	%	11.5	32.1	44.9	11.5	0	100.0

Chi Square = 3.48 df = 3 p = .32

Item #6		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	28	35	4	1	1	69
	%	40.6	50.7	5.8	1.4	1.4	85.2
Yes	#	4	6	2	0	0	12
	%	33.3	50.0	16.7	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	32	41	6	1	1	81
	%	39.5	50.6	7.4	1.2	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 2.11 df = 4 p = .71

Item #7		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	5	26	32	4	0	67
	%	7.5	38.8	47.8	6.0	0	84.8
Yes	#	3	2	7	0	0	12
	%	25.0	16.7	58.3	0	0	15.2
Totals	#	8	28	39	4	0	79
	%	10.1	35.4	49.4	5.1	0	100.0

Chi Square = 5.44 df = 3 p = .14

Item #8		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	32	17	9	10	1	69
	%	46.4	24.6	13.0	14.5	1.4	86.3
Yes	#	4	4	1	2	0	11
	%	36.4	36.4	9.1	18.2	0	13.8
Totals	#	36	21	10	12	1	80
	%	45.0	26.3	12.5	15.0	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 1.07 df = 4 p = .90

Item #9		Responses					
Teach Jr.Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	10	16	5	28	8	67
	%	14.9	23.9	7.5	41.8	11.9	84.8
Yes	#	2	2	1	5	2	12
	%	16.7	16.7	8.3	41.7	16.7	15.2
Totals	#	12	18	6	33	10	79
	%	15.2	22.8	7.6	41.8	12.7	100.0
Chi Square = .44			df = 4		p = .98		

Item #10		Responses					
Teach Jr.Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	18	41	7	3	0	69
	%	26.1	59.4	10.1	4.3	0	85.2
Yes	#	3	8	1	0	0	12
	%	25.0	66.7	8.3	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	21	49	8	3	0	81
	%	25.9	60.5	9.9	3.7	0	100.0
Chi Square = .65			df = 3		p = .88		

Item #11		Responses					
Teach Jr.Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	20	36	5	1	68
	%	8.8	29.4	52.9	7.4	1.5	85.0
Yes	#	0	4	8	0	0	12
	%	0	33.3	66.7	0	0	15.0
Totals	#	6	24	44	5	1	80
	%	7.5	30.0	55.0	6.3	1.3	100.0
Chi Square = 2.52			df = 4		p = .64		

Item #12		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	29	31	8	0	1	69
	%	42.0	44.9	11.6	0	1.4	85.2
Yes	#	6	6	0	0	0	12
	%	50.0	50.0	0	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	35	37	8	0	1	81
	%	43.2	45.7	9.9	0	1.2	100.0
Chi Square = 1.77			df = 3		p = .62		

Item #13		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	6	30	18	12	3	69
	%	8.7	43.5	26.1	17.4	4.3	85.2
Yes	#	1	6	2	3	0	12
	%	8.3	50.0	16.7	25.0	0	14.8
Totals	#	7	36	20	15	3	81
	%	8.6	44.4	24.7	18.5	3.7	100.0
Chi Square = 1.31			df = 4		p = .86		

Item #14		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	S.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	4	24	21	16	2	67
	%	6.0	35.8	31.3	23.9	3.0	84.8
Yes	#	0	6	6	0	0	12
	%	0	50.0	50.0	0	0	15.2
Totals	#	4	30	27	16	2	79
	%	5.1	38.0	34.2	20.3	2.5	100.0
Chi Square = 5.51			df = 4		p = .24		

Item #15		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	3	10	26	20	10	69
	%	4.3	14.5	37.7	29.0	14.5	85.2
Yes	#	1	3	4	2	2	12
	%	8.3	25.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	14.8
Totals	#	4	13	30	22	12	81
	%	4.9	16.0	37.0	27.2	14.8	100.0

Chi Square = 1.69 df = 4 p = .79

Item #16		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	6	22	32	6	68
	%	2.9	8.8	32.4	47.1	8.8	85.0
Yes	#	0	0	5	7	0	12
	%	0	0	41.7	58.3	0	15.0
Totals	#	2	6	27	39	6	80
	%	2.5	7.5	33.8	48.8	7.5	100.0

Chi Square = 2.99 df = 4 p = .56

Item #17		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	5	12	34	16	68
	%	1.5	7.4	17.6	50.0	23.5	85.0
Yes	#	0	0	3	6	3	12
	%	0	0	25.0	50.0	25.0	15.0
Totals	#	1	5	15	40	19	80
	%	1.3	6.3	18.8	50.0	23.8	100.0

Chi Square = 1.36 df = 4 p = .85

Item #18		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	7	28	18	14	1	68
	%	10.3	41.2	26.5	20.6	1.5	85.0
Yes	#	3	7	1	1	0	12
	%	25.0	58.3	8.3	8.3	0	15.0
Totals	#	10	35	19	15	1	80
	%	12.5	43.8	23.8	18.8	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.86 df = 4 p = .30

Item #19		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	10	22	22	14	69
	%	1.4	14.5	31.9	31.9	20.3	85.2
Yes	#	0	1	6	3	2	12
	%	0	8.3	50.0	25.0	16.7	14.8
Totals	#	1	11	28	25	16	81
	%	1.2	13.6	34.6	30.9	19.8	100.0

Chi Square = 1.65 df = 4 p = .80

Item #20		Responses					
Teach Jr. Hi.?		S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	10	39	10	8	2	69
	%	14.5	56.5	14.5	11.6	2.9	85.2
Yes	#	4	5	0	3	0	12
	%	33.3	41.7	0	25.0	0	14.8
Totals	#	14	44	10	11	2	81
	%	17.3	54.3	12.3	13.6	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 5.95 df = 4 p = .20

Item #21 Teach Jr. Hi.?		Responses S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	12	14	29	7	64
	%	3.1	18.8	21.9	45.3	10.9	85.3
Yes	#	0	2	2	5	2	11
	%	0	18.2	18.2	45.5	18.2	14.7
Totals	#	2	14	16	34	9	75
	%	2.7	18.7	21.3	45.3	12.0	100.0

Chi Square = .81 df = 4 p = .93

Item #22 Teach Jr. Hi.?		Responses S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	7	34	23	4	1	69
	%	10.1	49.3	33.3	5.8	1.4	85.2
Yes	#	0	7	5	0	0	12
	%	0	58.3	41.7	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	7	41	28	4	1	81
	%	8.6	50.6	34.6	4.9	1.2	100.0

Chi Square = 2.46 df = 4 p = .65

Item #23 Teach Jr. Hi.?		Responses S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	2	9	19	30	9	69
	%	2.9	13.0	27.5	43.5	13.0	86.3
Yes	#	0	0	4	5	2	11
	%	0	0	36.4	45.5	18.2	13.8
Total	#	2	9	23	35	11	80
	%	2.5	11.3	28.8	43.8	13.8	100.0

Chi Square = 2.20 df = 4 p = .70

Item #24 Teach Jr. Hi.?		Responses S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	5	29	24	9	2	69
	%	7.2	42.0	34.8	13.0	2.9	85.2
Yes	#	2	5	5	0	0	12
	%	16.7	41.7	41.7	0	0	14.8
Totals	#	7	34	29	9	2	81
	%	8.6	42.0	35.8	11.1	2.5	100.0

Chi Square = 3.10 df = 4 p = .54

Item #25 Teach Jr. Hi.?		Responses S.A.	A.	U.	D.	S.D.	Total
No	#	1	15	36	12	1	65
	%	1.5	23.1	55.4	18.5	1.5	85.5
Yes	#	0	3	6	2	0	11
	%	0	27.3	54.5	18.2	0	14.5
Totals	#	1	18	42	14	1	76
	%	1.3	23.7	55.3	18.4	1.3	100.0

Chi Square = .40 df = 4 p = .98